DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 623 AA 001 041

AUTHOR	Ironside, Roderick A.
TITLE	The 1971-72 Nationwide Installation of the Multiunit/IGE Model for Elementary Schools. A Process Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Program Planning and Evaluation (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ETS-PR-72-15
PUB DATE	Sep 72
CONTRACT	OEC-0-71-3705
NOTE	291p.; Volume I of two volumes
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; Educational Objectives; Educational Specifications; Elementary Schools; *Formative Evaluation; Individualized Programs; *Instructional Innovation; Interviews; *Multiunit Schools; National Surveys; *Program Planning; Questionnaires; Research Reviews (Publications); *School Surveys; Site Analysis; Statewide Planning; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	IGE; Individually Guided Education; Multiunit School Organization; MUSE

ABSTRACT

The process of installation of specified and instructional patterns in more than 200 elementary schools from ten states is evaluated. The findings of data gathered from questionnaires, site visits, training sessions, and interviews represent four major project procedures. Eight chapters cover the study as follows: I. Purposes, Background, and Summary; II. Instrument Development; III. School Survey Questionnaire; IV. District Survey Questionnaire; V. Detailed Installation Questionnaire; VI. Site Visits to Multiunit-IGE Schools; VII. Installation Models and Designs; and VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations. Included in four appendixes are the questionnaires used in the project: (a) School Survey; (c) District Survey; (e) Detailed Installation; and (g) Visit Report Forms. (For Volume II of this study see ED 066 624 in this issue.) (LS)

PPE- AA

PR - 72 - 15

The 1971-72 Nationwide Installation of the Multiunit/IGE Model for Elementary Schools

A PROCESS EVALUATION

Roderick A. Ironside

Project Director

VOLUME I

OEC-0-71-3705

September 1972

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

The 1971-72 Nationwide Installation of the Multiunit/IGE Model for Elementary Schools

A PROCESS EVALUATION

Foreword

As a process evaluation, the study reported here has as its subject the installation of specified organizational and instructional patterns in more than 200 elementary schools in ten states, during the 1971-72 school year. Such an undertaking in one academic year necessarily required a good deal of organization and instruction itself. And indeed, the process evaluation is concerned with the preparatory, training, and supportive activities engaged in by the several national and state sponsoring agencies to insure appropriate installation of the innovative practices.

Along with those accounting functions inherent in the evaluation, an equally important purpose was to study the patterns--once installed in the schools--in order to describe the "other side" of the installation: the implementation practices at the school level. Thus a considerable body of normative data was gathered along with feedback potentially useful in planning, training, and preparation for future installation projects.

Questionnaires, site visits, attendance at training sessions, interviews, and study of a continuing inflow of documents and materials were all used as data sources in arriving at installation and implementation findings. These findings are both numerous and detailed. Consequently, although many data were gathered concurrently, the findings are presented in four separate chapters representing the four major project procedures.

Because of their nature (and the schedules and populations involved) there is some overlap in content as well as in findings and conclusions. Given topics were studied at different times and from differing points of view, and thus the reader will encounter some purposeful duplication. We trust that he will put it all together, as we have tried to do, in the final chapter devoted to overall conclusions and recommendations.

This study was conducted under contract with the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
O E Contract Number 0-71-3705

Educational Testing Service Durham, North Carolina September 1972

PREFACE

For the completion of the various tasks included in the evaluation project reported here, and for the continuing communications and assistance provided, the writer expresses special appreciation to a number of persons in several organizations. It goes without saying that without their involvement there would have been no project.

To the state and city coordinators for reviewing instruments, providing extensive installation information, and making arrangements for school visits and attendance at League as well as other training sessions; and for otherwise providing counsel and assistance throughout the year.

To the principals and faculties of new MUSE/IGE schools--and to various district personnel--who completed the questionnaires, arranged for interviews, and opened their schools to site visitors on several occasions.

To staff members of the Wisconsin R & D Center for sharing materials, background information, and project purposes; and for arranging participation in various training activities.

To personnel in the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation (of the U. S. Office of Education) for providing general guidance, reviewing instruments, aiding in the gathering of installation data, and assisting with the evaluation design.

To staff members of I/D/E/A for sharing training materials, background information, and evaluation plans.

To ETS personnel in the Princeton, Evanston, and Durham offices who traveled far and wide to visit schools, observe inservice training, and participate in other installation activities and meetings.

To staff members of the ETS-Durham office who carried out the task of organizing, reviewing, typing, and preparing the myriad materials used in the study, and who provided technical assistance in the preparation, coding, programing, and interpretation of data.

Nothing would be done at all
If a man waited
Til he could do it so well
That no one could find fault with it.

-- Newman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

Foreword

Preface

Chapter

I PURPOSES, BACKGROUND, AND SUMMARY 1
Introduction 1
Purposes 3
Limitations 6
Background 6
Summary 9
Procedure 9
Findings 13
Policy Recommendations 18
Summary of Project Outcomes 24

II INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT 25

III SCHOOL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE 34
Introduction 36
Findings 41
Background of Total Group of Schools 42
Basic Practices Related to MUSE/IGE Installation 47
Extent of Training and Exposure 54
Resources and Assistance Available 64
Staff Development Workshop 70
Preschool Workshop 72
Formal Inservice Training for Whole School Staff 74
Other Areas of Interest and Concern 78

IV DISTRICT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE 83
Introduction 84
Findings 88

V DETAILED INSTALLATION QUESTIONNAIRE 103
Introduction 103
Selection of the Sample 104
Administration and Response 105
Findings 106
District Representative 106
IMC Director-Librarian 109
Specialist in IGE Subject-area 111
Principal 112
Unit Teacher 122
The Teaching Unit 129
Instructional Improvement Committee (IIC) 131
Items Common to All Individual Respondents 140

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

VI SITE VISITS TO MULTIUNIT-IGE SCHOOLS.....146
Introduction.....146
Procedure.....146
Visit Schedule.....148
Visit Atmosphere.....150
Individual School Reports (Case Studies).....151
Additional Observations on Visit Schools.....203
Findings Across All Visit Schools.....208
Inservice Training.....208
General Features.....210
Relationships Between Visits and Questionnaires.....214
The Real Issue: Spirit and Commitment.....215

VII INSTALLATION MODELS AND DESIGNS.....217
Introduction.....217
Training Design.....217
Installation Model.....219
Implementation Design at the School Level.....220
Instructional Programing Model.....220
Findings.....221

VIII CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....227
Introduction.....227
Conclusions.....229
Recommendations.....234
Operations at the School Level.....234
Policy Recommendations.....237

APPENDIXES INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE PROJECT
A School Survey Questionnaire
C District Survey Questionnaire
E Detailed Installation Questionnaire
G Visit Report Forms

VOLUME II

APPENDIXES (Appendixes A, C, E, and G appear in Volume I)

B Tables Reporting School Survey Findings
D Tables Reporting District Survey Findings
F Tables Reporting Detailed Questionnaire Findings
H State Summary Sheets Accounting for All Schools
I Formal Agreements at National, State, District Levels
J Composite Data Bases for Visit Schools

CHAPTER I

PURPOSES, BACKGROUND, AND SUMMARY

Introduction

Many elementary schools around the country have been organized in recent years into teaching units in one or another form, often in buildings constructed to enhance teamwork among small groups of teachers. Similarly, learning programs of various sorts have for a long time been built on instructional objectives and assessment of achievement aimed at optimum education for the individual. Both of these areas--group planning and teaching within schools and efforts to match instruction to individuals' needs--have represented departures from traditional school practice, and as such have often been approached as innovations or experiments. Moreover, in many instances, but one element of the area has been exposed to tryout...for example, grouping children in a given subject according to specific test outcomes or organizing teachers of a given grade level into a confederation for sharing methods and materials.

The literature is replete with descriptions of these programs--particularly those in some way related to individualization--and with reactions, evaluations, and discussions. Thus the general concepts underlying individualized education and group teaching are well known. In fact, the view has frequently been expressed that while the concepts are widely known and accepted, practice has often been limited to sporadic local attempts or brief trial periods or a single curriculum area. In particular, the lack of an all-embracing program has been noted, one which would combine the intended innovations into an organic whole, which would answer the many problems arising from changed purposes and procedures, and which would affect the total educational endeavor in the school. Too often, it has been held, the valued innovation has been expected to survive in a milieu where it was the only change.

In response to this need for a more systematic approach, a coordinated system called IGE (Individually Guided Education) has been developed and promoted within the past two or three years. A synthesis of the efforts of the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning and the Institute for Development of Educational Activities (IDEA), IGE embraces several interrelated areas of activity. Primary among these are the learning program and the school organization, which have come to be known popularly as IGE (for the individually-guided learning program) and MUSE (for the multi-unit school organization).

IGE and MUSE are conceptually intertwined. While IGE represents a programing model for individually guided education in the various curriculum areas (through objectives, preassessment, grouping, selection of materials, choice of learning modes, assessment, regrouping), MUSE is intended to provide an enhancing school organization which insures the use of all resources in the pursuit of individualization. MUSE is thus developed as an organizational superstructure and set of personnel relationships which then provides an environment in which individualized education can flourish. Both patterns represent considerable change for most schools, and perhaps MUSE has required the more unusual sorts of changes. In its essence it is an organizational strategy involving school districts, schools, and instructional units within schools. These units, which are intended to replace age-grade placements in self-contained classrooms, are composed of defined groups of students, teachers, and various assistants working in a variety of groupings and settings. Multiaging of the students is a key feature in this arrangement. In addition, the leaders of the units, along with the principal and perhaps others, constitute a permanent committee for the governance of the instructional program and the provision of needed resources. Thus, not only are there the new instructional purposes and strategies of the IGE pattern, but there are also differentiated roles and new relationships in the MUSE pattern.

Under the aegis of the two organizations (Wisconsin R & D Center and I/D/E/A), these patterns were adopted in a number of schools in Ohio, Wisconsin, Colorado, New York, Oregon, and Minnesota in the period 1968-71. (By the 1970-71 school year there were approximately 164 schools at some stage in the implementation process; in two states this was conducted through the state department of education). To a considerable degree the two agencies operated independently of one another, but cooperated in the provision of training and curricular materials, plans for training school staffs, and continued development of underlying concepts and installation techniques. At the same time, the two organizations employed different methods in installing the innovations, emphasized new roles differently, defined the total IGE system in terms of different sets of components, and prepared separate guides for MUSE and IGE implementation.

Out of this background there developed an increasing awareness of the educational potential of the MUSE and IGE patterns. As a result, the Wisconsin R & D Center was funded by three agencies within the Office of Education to install the multiunit structure on a nationwide basis in the

1971-72 school year. The contract called for installation in about 250 schools. While emphasis was on the multiunit organization, it was assumed that IGE purposes would also be served in the installing schools. The Office of Education announced its support as one way to disseminate innovations which had already proven their effectiveness and potential in the research and development stages.

Purposes

Whereas the earlier installations of MUSE and IGE had been done on a somewhat informal basis--and also represented development and field trial efforts to an extent--the projected activity for 1971-72 was to be handled in a more structured way. The R & D Center plan called for written agreements at the state level (with the state department of education acting as the implementation agency), and these were arranged in nine states: South Carolina, New Jersey, Connecticut, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Colorado. In addition, the Center provided some assistance to more local regions in California, Nebraska, New York, and Virginia. At the outset of the 1971-72 school year it appeared that there would be a total of 270 installing schools in the nine states and four local areas, about 80% beginning the implementation in September and the remainder in the second semester.

It was this structured nationwide installation effort which was of interest to the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation (an agency within the Office of Education), and which is the subject of this investigation. The general objective was to provide an independent evaluation of the multiunit school installation project.

Within this framework, the primary purpose was to conduct a "process-validation" study, wherein observation of the installation process would permit description of the manner and extent to which the planned activities had been carried out.

The Center staff had developed an installation model composed of several training layers and involving a variety of personnel at state, district, and local levels.* Application of the model required formal commitments at several educational levels, the transmission of training from one group to another, adherence to certain minimal implementation criteria, communication within and between a large number of groups, and a variety of related considerations. Another important aspect of the model was that while the awareness

---

* This model, and related designs, are described in Chapter VII.

and training programs were coordinated by the R & D Center, the implementation process itself was the responsibility of the states and local schools. Thus the model must be recognized as something different from a single linear pattern or standard. Fulfillment of the R & D Center's own projected activities would not suffice for the completed installation; the model left a great deal to the several states and many schools to work out according to their perceptions and needs and abilities.

This latter point serves to emphasize a second aspect of the overall purpose: to determine the extent to which MUSE and IGE patterns actually were adopted across the range of schools. By year's end, were the schools recognizable as classical MUSE/IGE installations? Did the schools typically follow the implementation criteria? In sum, what were the basic outcomes--at the school level--of the total installation process?

The primary purpose--as outlined above in terms of two aspects--clearly was intended to serve an accounting function. To be sure, the MUSE and IGE patterns had already been researched and developed and extended to several locations (primarily in Wisconsin) by the R & D Center, prior to the 1971-72 school year. In these instances the Center was geographically and psychologically close at hand to provide training, support, and management. But the nationwide installation represented an endeavor on a scale far surpassing the previous work--in a large number of schools spread over at least nine states. Necessarily, such an enterprise was bound to encounter considerable variation in the way states, districts, and local schools would follow the installation model with respect to training, priorities, assignments, and implementation steps. Moreover, the model called for many intermediaries between the R & D Center staff and the staff of the individual schools. Expansion would bring new persons and agencies, such as the state education department, state coordinator, local coordinator, consultants, college personnel, regional linkages of school staffs, and district policy groups.

The second major purpose of the investigation was to provide feedback to those involved in various aspects of the installation process. Since the accounting function would develop descriptions of the implementation steps undertaken at the school level as well as the installation activities at national and state levels, there would be a considerable body of descriptive information of potential usefulness to a wide range of persons. This would include the staff of the Wisconsin R & D Center and the state coordinators in particular, but would also pertain to district personnel, school

principals, university program staff, and officers of various school linkage groups.

Because of the feedback opportunity inherent in the study, it was planned to gather data on a number of questions above and beyond those developed for accounting purposes. In particular, information was gathered concerning the following:

- reactions and attitudes of school staff members
- nature of the problems encountered in implementing MUSE/IGE
- extent of use of the training and implementation materials
- impacts resulting from adoption of the new patterns
- aspects of the decision-making process in the school

It was expected that these sorts of feedback would be useful to those in charge of planning for future expansion, especially with respect to anticipating local needs, developing tentative operational timelines, outlining reasonable expectations, and so on.

The importance of a wide range of feedback is emphasized when it is recalled that the installation project is a nationwide one; presumably there would be differences in the approaches taken by different states and dissemination of these findings might have special value. Similarly, the investigation is concerned with the first attempt at such broadscale installation, and findings obtained in the first operational year would also be of particular interest to developers and planners.

Summary of Purposes

1. To conduct an independent process evaluation of the first-year installation of MUSE and IGE patterns.
   a) document and describe the training and installation activities carried out by the various national and state agencies
   b) describe the extent of implementation activity at the school level, based upon predetermined implementation criteria

2. To derive feedback of general utility to a variety of persons involved in the overall installation process.

In examining the findings based upon the fulfillment of these purposes, the Office of Education expects to derive guidance on these points of special interest: (a) information for dissemination activities concerning MUSE/IGE concepts and installation, (b) installation strategies of greatest

promise and those in need of revision, and (c) feasibility of continuing and/or expanding the installation project. These applications are of considerable importance in view of current projections for adding schools to the installation schedule annually. In 1972-73, a new cohort of schools will begin the MUSE/IGE patterns in the same nine states involved in 1971-72; state coordinators will manage the installation based upon their previous year's experience. However, there are also proposals to extend the innovations to a number of additional states in the 1973-74 school year.

Limitations

Four limitations in particular should be noted. First, the investigation was not concerned with demonstrating the worth of the concepts underlying school organization or individualized education, or with demonstrating their workability. The potential values of the new patterns had already been evidenced in the development and field-trial periods, and the whole installation project assumed that MUSE and IGE were adaptable and adoptable in the schools.

Second, there was no attempt to assess children's learning or achievement under the new school patterns. It was assumed that there would probably not be meaningful gains or losses in achievement in any case, but the focus of the project was on the installation process and implementation of changed procedures.

Third, while Individually Guided Education has been defined as seven mutually supportive sets of activities, only the major two were dealt with in the study: IGE instructional programing and the multiunit school organization.

Fourth, the full range of implementation criteria developed by the R & D Center was not used in studying the progress or status of the individual schools. Many of the criteria described an end-point after two or three years of implementation and refinement, and thus could not be employed in the first operational year.

Background

An important step in ETS participation in the evaluation project was the acquisition of an extensive background concerning the MUSE and IGE patterns as well as the installation activities. A plan was devised for gaining such

background early in the contract period, both before and during the opening month of the school year. Through observation, correspondence, interviews, and study of materials it was possible to lay the groundwork for these fundamental purposes:

1. to establish relationships with personnel involved in the installation at national and state levels
2. to internalize the MUSE/IGE theoretical framework and the specific national, state, and local installation plans
3. to develop the instruments so as to take account of appropriate terms, reasonable performance expectations, clear definitions, appropriate item alternatives, and meaningful content
4. to provide a basis for the best interpretation of findings and their use as feedback to various groups
5. to arrange for formal school visits, up-to-date rosters and mailing lists, and continuing means of communication

Of particular concern were the elements of the projected "training chain", priorities at national and state levels, and the initial implementation steps at the school level. In pursuit of all the aforementioned purposes, the following interrelated activities were undertaken.

1. Study of the IGE training booklets (published by I/D/E/A), several IGE films and soundstrips, proposals and reports prepared by the Wisconsin R & D Center, installation outlines and plans, the R & D implementation guide and criteria, the I/D/E/A implementation guide, related curriculum materials, promotional and descriptive booklets, earlier OE reports.

2. Meeting with various staff members of the Wisconsin R & D Center, in three different settings. One meeting provided a detailed historical perspective and installation overview; the second involved contact with the installation team itself; the third was a formal meeting for relating ETS responsibilities to R & D Center plans and policies.

3. Meeting with staff members of I/D/E/A. Historical perspective, installation plans, feedback instruments, and training materials were studied and discussed. (This was a fortuitous contact, since it developed later that several states had agreements with both the R & D Center and I/D/E/A).

4. Attendance at R & D Center training session related to reading as an IGE subject-area. Provided opportunity to talk with additional R & D staff members, and to meet several of the state coordinators for the first time.

5. Visits with principals and unit leaders (and others) in three schools which had installed MUSE/IGE in 1970-71. Study of their procedures, priorities, and advice.

6. Observation of five 2-day "Preschool Workshops" in late August and early September, one in each of five states. These schools were all installing MUSE/IGE in 1971-72. In all cases there was contact with state coordinator.

7. Attendance at a conference of principals from one state; related to intrastate communication plans and inservice training. Conferred with principals, state coordinator, and director of R & D installation team. Attendance at similar meeting in a second state. In both cases newly installing schools were also visited.

8. Attendance at a League training session for unit leaders at the state level; and -- in another state -- at a workshop designed to provide staff-development training prior to second semester installation.

9. Participation in a formal meeting of all state coordinators at the R & D Center; further contact with R & D staff, curriculum developers, coordinators, and others.

The activities outlined above occurred in an overlapping way during the period July to October, 1971, and were in addition to several contacts with Office of Education personnel and considerable telephone communication. This "readiness period" actually continued through several months, in the sense that each project activity brought with it new perceptions or information and thus constituted substantive input for later activities.

Beyond these initial efforts, there was an attempt to keep informed throughout the year. This included observation of a formal training session for unit leaders, regular mailings from several of the state coordinators, contact with R & D Center and I/D/E/A staff, perusal of progress reports and outlines, attendance at a second meeting for coordinators, rechecking of state rosters, and so on. This was of course valuable. For example, two developments were learned of (in each case from only one of several possible sources) which had a bearing on project activities: the calendar for R & D Center-sponsored training workshops for principals and unit leaders held during the winter months, which provided an opportunity to attend one such session and had implications for the accounting of training events; and second, the plans of I/D/E/A to poll many of the schools with fall and spring questionnaires (as well as visits), which had implications for our own schedule.

Thus it was possible to keep fairly well abreast of events and circumstances which developed along the way as well as those which had been

planned or announced earlier. Not all of them were noted, certainly, since varying levels of communication were maintained by the several national and state sources.

One other aspect of background should also be discussed. As implied above, new information of considerable import became available intermittently during the study period. Such information often announced changes or new plans, or revealed an array of disparate but related activities in the various states--and these in turn affected the manner in which the evaluation work was carried out. In particular, it became evident that it would not be feasible to judge degrees of effective implementation (at the school level) against stated criteria or to isolate correlates of "successful" implementations. This had earlier appeared to be possible and desirable. However, absolute criteria of effective implementation which could be applied at given points in time were not available. While various sets of criteria did exist, differing combinations appeared to be used in the several states for suggesting that schools either were or were not on target. This circumstance was taken into account in developing certain of the instruments and in interpreting the findings.

Not surprisingly, it appeared that the installation effort--and its many aspects--was developmental. Of necessity, various plans, goals, and activities were subject to change through the course of the first year program. This was true at all levels: national, state, district, and school--and was exacerbated by different priorities, definitions, plans, and schedules within states as well as across states. In turn, these circumstances resulted in a certain degree of flexibility in the plans and activities of the evaluation study.

Summary of Evaluation Project

PROCEDURE

As outlined in detail in subsequent chapters, three separate procedures and also a continuing contact with various information sources constituted the approach used for gathering data on MUSE/IGE installation activities and on implementation steps at the school level. Instruments used in the study appear in Appendixes A, C, E, and G.

First, a survey questionnaire was administered to principals of all 287 schools listed on rosters supplied by 9 state coordinators and 2 city coordinators. Since this included schools installing at various times, administrations were conducted on February 1, April 1, and May 1, in order

to reflect practices approximately 3 to 5 months after initiation of MUSE/IGE. There were two foci: (a) an accounting of the various formal and informal training events participated in by school staff members both before and after MUSE/IGE initiation; and (b) a description of implementation status in terms of several practices deemed basic to the installation process. This was the only means of contact with all schools, and so other areas of interest were also tapped: background and descriptive features, notable impacts within the first few months, reactions to certain training events, and school communication with parents. In addition to check-list information about training activities attended, three important events were explored in some detail; these were the initial training for principals and unit leaders, the total staff workshop prior to opening of school, and scheduled inservice training during the school year.

A similar but briefer questionnaire was sent at the same time to a representative of each district with schools newly installing in 1971-72. There were again two foci: (a) an accounting of formal and informal training activities undertaken by district personnel; and (b) the nature of support and assistance provided by the district to the individual school. In addition (again, this was the only attempt to contact all districts), other concerns were also examined, such as district relationships with the larger MUSE/IGE structures, indications of impact, district background in fostering innovations, and reasons for adopting MUSE/IGE.

Both instruments were reviewed, pretested, and then revised; and follow-up activities were undertaken after one month. In all, there were 205 usable returns from school principals and 112 from the districts. Findings from the principals' instrument were analyzed and reported by total group, by semester, and by state; those for the districts were reported only by total group.

Second, a set of detailed questionnaires was administered at the end of April to a 20% sample of the original roster of 287 schools. Selection was made on the basis of response to the first questionnaire, proportions of installing schools among the several states, and inclusion in the group of schools visited during the year; no attempt was made at random selection since generalization of findings was not proposed. Different instruments were prepared for several individuals and groups within the school staff, with

emphasis upon (a) detailed information concerning the nature and functioning of the MUSE organization and (b) the procedures used in IGE instructional programing. Questions were meant to gauge implementation practices as close to the end of the school year as possible, and had been drawn primarily from the detailed criteria set forth in the R & D Center implementation guide; they were organized around 12 selected central aspects of MUSE and IGE.

In addition, feedback was sought regarding implementation priorities, problems faced, solutions found, reactions to training activities, use of a variety of resources in the implementation, needs at the local level, and reactions to the MUSE/IGE concepts and changes.

Aside from amassing such data for their own intrinsic value and for potential feedback value to planners and practitioners, there was an additional purpose. To the extent that given practices occurred in the sample of schools as evidencing their implementation status, it would be possible to hazard tentative guesses about likely status in the balance of the schools. If, for example, many schools appeared to have moved quite slowly toward certain important criteria, such a finding might be used in drawing conclusions about the installation schedule, the need to further poll all schools, or the criteria themselves.

Instruments were reviewed, pretested, and revised; and a follow-up was conducted after 3 weeks. Responses were received from 60 schools; using certain reponse criteria, it was judged that 49 of these had sent in complete returns. Findings were analyzed by total group, in terms of each category: principal, teachers, teaching units, librarian, the Instructional Improvement Committee, and IGE subject specialists.

Third, visits were arranged in each of eight states at three schools which had been randomly selected. Since schedules and access to schools varied by state, numbers and times of visits also varied. In all, 25 schools were observed for a total of 50 visits. Ten schools were visited three times--in fall, winter, and spring; the preschool workshops of five of these were also attended (at the beginning of the year), allowing enough contact and data to develop implementation case-studies.

The one-day visits were made during normal instructional days, with interview and observation as the principal approaches; records, curriculum materials, agendas, inservice programs, and other print items were also studied. Interviews and observations were not structured but report forms

were developed for recording findings and impressions on a large number of topics. Interviews were always held with the principal, and where possible with unit leaders, teachers, librarian, special teachers, children; and any state, district, or university representatives who may have been on hand. Observations were made of the library and other facilities in action, and of classes in session (particularly where IGE programing was being followed). Visits were arranged to include attendance at meetings of the Instructional Improvement Committee and the teaching units. Finally, inservice training sessions were also observed whenever possible, in some cases on a second day.

There were two major purposes for the visits--first, as a way of validating information obtained from questionnaire responses (for the particular schools involved) and thus of suggesting problem areas where variance might be expected in the total installation; and second, as a way of studying the dynamics of installation in a small number of schools and especially of noting the nature and direction of changes over the year.

The three data-gathering procedures were expected to serve interactive purposes as well. The detailed questionnaires were expected to clarify and amplify on the findings from the survey instrument with respect to the 20% sample of schools involved; it was also anticipated that such comparison would suggest the variations in the implementation process to be found in the total group of schools. And, as noted above, visits were intended to serve a verifying function (toward the end of the year) regarding responses provided in the survey and detailed questionnaires.

In some cases it was possible to relate the visit and questionnaire functions. For example, fall and winter visits contributed immeasurably to the development of both the survey and detailed instruments; and in turn, questionnaire responses were used as leads for follow-up in subsequent visits where applicable.

All the aforementioned were taken into account in setting up the schedule for these procedures; and particular attention had to be paid to the fact of quite different installation dates and schedules within and across states. Thus the survey instrument had to be administered far enough into the installation period to allow certain basic implementation activities to be operative. Similarly, visits were arranged in order to take advantage of

previously-acquired questionnaire responses. And the detailed questionnaires were administered as close as possible to the end of the school year, especially important for schools which initiated MUSE/IGE in the second semester. The overall schedule is outlined in the following chart; the particulars are made clearer in the chapters devoted to each separate procedure.

1971-72	Initial Background Period	Three Site Visits	Survey Questionnaire		Detailed Questionnaire	
			First Semester	Second Semester	First Semester	Second Semester
July	x					
August	x					
September	x					
October	x	x				
November		x				
December						
January						
February		x	Feb. 1			
March						
April				Apr. 1	April 25	
May		x		May 1 (N.J.)		May 1

Fourth, as referred to earlier in the section on Background, a continuing effort was made to keep in touch with the activities and plans of the R & D Center and the state coordinators, especially as these related to training events, assistance to schools, and the application of implementation criteria. Some contact was made by direct correspondence and by phone; but greater amounts were accomplished through personal contact at several meetings and the receipt of a variety of materials during the year. While such communication did not constitute a precise procedural step as such, it provided much information of use in conducting the visit and questionnaire activities and it also served to describe in part the formal installation program at national and state levels.

FINDINGS

The following sets of returns and data sources are considered in this section on major findings of the study: (a) 205 responses from principals, for the survey instrument; (b) 112 responses from district representatives, for the survey instrument; (c) responses from personnel in 45 to 55 schools for each of the several instruments constituting the detailed questionnaire; (d) visit reports covering 50 site visits, 5 preschool workshops, and 11

inservice activities; (e) notes, plans, documents, rosters, records, etc., representing various sorts of contact with the R & D Center and the state coordinators. Major findings are denoted by letters in the margin.

A. As drawn from all sources listed above, one major and pervasive finding was that personnel involved in the installation project did not agree on what conditions constituted actual participation in the project or on when such participation began (or would begin). Concerning rosters of schools involved, there was a considerable degree of mismatch among principals, districts, the R & D Center Directory, and the rosters of state coordinators; there were even several disagreements between district personnel and school principals in those districts. Of the total of 287 schools listed from all sources, it appeared that at least 33 (or 11%) were incorrectly included: some had installed up to 3 years prior to September 1971, many did not plan to participate until September 1972, and a few indicated no past or future association whatsoever.

B. A related finding was that there existed diverse definitions of the initial steps involved in adopting MUSE/IGE. The detailed questionnaire revealed that among 45 principals, 14 different initiatory criteria were reported, in some cases relating to the MUSE organization only, in others to IGE instructional programing only, and in still others to the points at which either training or commitment took place.

C. Because of these circumstances, it was not possible to report how many schools did indeed install the MUSE/IGE patterns in the 1971-72 school year. Based upon the returns received and modest projections concerning the non-responding schools, it seems safe to guess that between 200 and 225 schools made changes of one sort or another which might be taken to represent adoption of the MUSE/IGE innovations. Clearly, some of these schools were close to fulfilling most of the implementation criteria provided by the R & D Center's guide, while others moved hesitantly toward the significant changes involved. Thus any figure that might be provided would almost surely mask the "quality" and extent of the installation at individual schools, and the problem of definition is not solved.

D. Another major finding, borne out by all the data sources, was that the implementation criteria provided by various guidelines lacked the specificity which many school personnel required. For many, it was not clear what the

sequence of installation steps should be once the innovations were initiated. Moreover, they felt a lack of priority listings among the myriad possible steps, and also noted the need for an implementation time frame. Many principals reported using several sets of criteria but still indicated frustration over having to find their own "local expertise" in the place of clearcut and sequenced guidelines and models. Similarly, teachers and others in many locations appeared to have only vague notions of the educational and organizational outcomes toward which they were headed, and they reported this as a weakness in their preparation.

With particular reference to the R & D Center criteria (performance objectives), it should be noted that they were carefully outlined and presented in a most readable manner. However, whereas they initially described a first-year operation, they later were billed as indicating endpoints after 3 or perhaps 4 years of installation effort. To fill this gap, the Center announced four minimum conditions which should describe a satisfactory status after several months: multiaged student groups, active Instructional Improvement Committee (IIC), fully unitized school, and instructional programing in one subject area according to the IGE model.

E. These four criteria, however, were not achieved by all schools. As determined by the survey instrument, 94% reported having an IIC, but a number of these met so short a time (or had no agenda or minutes as a basis for action) that their active nature might be questioned. Some 99% of the schools reported the organization of units; but on the basis of strict standards, it appeared that 56% of the 205 schools were fully unitized. In 11% of the schools there was no multiaging of students. Moreover, in many schools the children were organized into multiaged units within the building but received all instruction in grade-level or self-contained groups. On the final basic criterion, IGE instructional programing, the detailed instrument and site visits made it abundantly clear that this area, too, suffered from many definitions, and that a fair number of schools were not following the model, or were just beginning to develop their own instructional objectives. In fact, in a number of locations the IGE subject was in the process of being selected.

F. Related to the last point, it was discovered that many schools lacked the resources to adopt a packaged curriculum appropriate to IGE programing. As a result, they either began to develop their own system (objectives,

materials, assessments, etc.), or they delayed the IGE aspect of MUSE/IGE to the following year, or they adapted existing programs to one or two aspects of the model. To be sure, many schools did adopt the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development (Word Attack Section) and this served as an excellent vehicle for both demonstrating and using the instructional model. Other schools chose published programs in reading (most frequent), mathematics, and science as well as social studies. But the finding holds that for a large number of schools, IGE programing remained an ideal some distance away from their reality.

G. A bit more specifically, it is noted that most schools arranged for two important elements of support for individualized education along IGE lines: 97% of schools provided in-school time for unit meetings (from 1/2 to 5 hours per week), and 82% of schools typically had the services of an aide in the units (from less than 1/2 to as many as 3 aides per unit).

H. Another finding--which surely reflects the "shakedown" nature of the first year's installation--was that there were wide variations in the installation activities at all levels. This has been alluded to earlier, and relates to such matters as training opportunities provided, development of linkage groups, support and assistance, decision-making, communications, commitment, and actual MUSE/IGE practices in the schools. In fact, there were notable differences <u>within</u> schools, where units made different decisions concerning multiaging, IGE subject-areas, grouping, programing, inservice training, and so on. Clearly, at state, district, and school levels (and even at the unit level) the participants were finding their way and in the process developing separate priorities and procedures.

I. It appears that the suggested training sequence of five elements (national awareness, state and district commitment, one-day local commitment three-day training for school leaders, and three-to-five day training for entire school staff) was not a constant which was practiced or recognized by all personnel involved. While some district personnel participated in all five steps, this was not typical, and indeed relatively few participated in the local commitment and training sessions. Nor was it typical for principals to be involved in the four steps which applied to them. There were many gaps, in varying degrees among the states and districts. For example, some schools did not have the local preschool training for the staff, although substitutes were arranged in some cases. Certainly not all principals and unit leaders attended the training arranged for them at the state

or university level (in many cases because unit leaders had not yet been assigned). And many districts did not hold a local commitment/overview session for school staffs.

At national and state levels, a number of additional training opportunities were provided. The R & D Center had arranged for several special mid-year workshops for principals and unit leaders, and by and large these were well attended by staff members from the 1971-72 schools. And many activities of a training and mutual-support nature were sponsored by state and regional linkages of schools as well as by state coordinators. These included school visits, training for aides, policy meetings for principals, and IGE training for general school personnel.

J. Through these many agencies, then, there were literally dozens of carefully defined as well as general training opportunities provided to school personnel. It appears that the R & D Center workshops directed to specific groups and the activities promoted by local, linkage, and state initiative were potentially as important in the whole training design as were the elements of the formal training chain. The findings suggest several interpretations: a) there was a real and continuing need for these opportunities; b) in sum, the whole array of training events favored principals and unit leaders; c) many individuals had what may be considered a minimum of training; d) schools, rather than persons, were recipients of the training; e) school staffs (and others) found ways of fulfilling their training needs on a local basis.

K. Personnel at all levels (in the sample of schools polled) noted particular weaknesses in the training provided and suggested a number of changes in the training plans. A major concern was that it had all happened too fast and that a longer planning period--along with more practical training--was needed for effective installation. These sentiments of course do not typify group reactions, but were frequent enough to suggest legitimate concerns.

L. Regular inservice training for the school staff was also promoted in the overall design. Amounts of such training varied tremendously among schools, from no reported inservice (21% of schools) to 30 or more hours within the first few months (reported by 5%). Topics most frequently covered were reading, IGE concerns (objectives, grouping children, reporting), and unit functions. About half the schools reported having a predetermined schedule for inservice training.

Of particular interest, a number of schools reported that inservice took place within the units or in ad hoc groups smaller than the whole school staff, and that even meetings and newsletters were considered to be inservice training. Moreover, 8% of principals indicated that inservice training is an ongoing condition, involved in all aspects of the day, and thus is not defined in formal terms. These schools did not have "inservice for the whole school staff" but did report the range of activities which for them constituted on-the-job training.

M. One final important area should be mentioned. Based upon input from all sources, there was a wide range of attitudes toward the MUSE/IGE patterns and toward the means used in implementing them. In some schools, the majority of the staff indicated dissatisfaction with methods and purposes, and general unhappiness with what "they had been forced into." In others, the level of staff enthusiasm was extremely high and it appeared that people, materials, and processes were pointed together in the direction of meaningful changes. Staff reaction in the majority of locations might be characterized as positive hesitancy...a favorable attitude mixed with cautious implementation activity.

N. It was possible to view MUSE and IGE as distinct domains, and there were individual and group differences in the level of acceptance of each. (IGE had a slight edge over MUSE in the total sample population). On the whole (based on returns from the sample of schools), school staff members were favorably disposed toward both patterns, although there was a clearcut hierarchy of acceptance from principals, to unit leaders, to librarians, to staff teachers.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Outlined below are the major policy recommendations growing out of the findings and interpretations involved in this study of the 1971-72 nationwide installation of MUSE/IGE. They are concerned mostly with the national and state agencies carrying out the installation project, but relate also to any group or agency which might participate. While the recommendations are expressed in abstract form, they have implicit reference to future installation efforts which might be undertaken on a national, state, or even local level. It is likely, of course, that a number of the matters considered here may already have become the subject of discussion or action.

1. There is a need for clearcut and sequenced criteria which may be followed in initiating MUSE/IGE implementation at the school level, and which would also describe typical or reasonable first-year activities as well as year-end expected status. Such criteria, once developed and widely disseminated, would likely serve to reduce local anxiety and increase implementation efficiency. Existing guidelines and criteria (those of the R & D Center, I/D/E/A, the New Jersey Department of Education, and other briefer versions) might be studied, revised, and combined in such development.

2. A related recommendation is that such criterion-guidelines be presented in several packages so that schools in varying circumstances might choose the most appropriate set, at least for the initial period of training and installation.

3. Districts and schools should make every effort to send the right staff members for various sorts of training (including the training chain, workshops for stated groups, and other training and exposure activities). Those who attend the first such training events, moreover, should continue to attend the remainder, and principals should no doubt be required to participate in all formal sessions. If the concepts underlying the planned training sequence and the whole notion of training are valid, then attendance and participation might well be insisted upon by state coordinators and others.

4. In the same sense that a training design is included in the installation model, a design for monitoring all schools would be a boon to the nationwide effort. Regular but brief and standard feedback to state coordinators and/or the R & D Center is recommended on such matters as: problems, status, needs, procedures, plans, and outcomes. The means by which districts and schools enhance implementation would be as important in such feedback as the actual fulfillment of MUSE and IGE requirements. And such feedback would permit interactive relationships among developers, programers, policy-makers, evaluators, and school personnel, and thus could be a part of the total installation process. Further, a monitoring mechanism is recommended for checking on the fulfillment of certain conditions, above and beyond a written agreement. The district's willingness and ability to provide resources for inservice training, to allow unit

planning time, and to obtain IGE curriculum materials are by definition requisite to implementation success. Equally important is the assurance that school staffs have expressed acceptance of the concepts and definite commitment to proceed.

5. MUSE and IGE concepts should be clearly defined and promoted as separate parts of an ultimate integrated whole. They represent two distinct though related packages of change (one organizational, one instructional) and need to be understood separately so that they are implemented fully. One term or the other is very frequently used to refer to the whole MUSE/IGE innovation, and thus various necessary aspects are overlooked or deemphasized in practice. Such clarification would help in using sequenced guidelines, initiating the new patterns, training staff, making plans, and marking progress.

6. If the accounting of schools participating in the MUSE/IGE patterns is important for various policy, funding, or dissemination reasons, then improved procedures are needed. Numbers, locations, status, and even plans should be determined accurately at all levels, and using a few "vital criteria" might be helpful in so cataloging schools. Apparently the use of written agreements or statements of intent will not suffice for such an accounting function.

7. It is recommended that careful study be made of the ways in which cooperation and common involvement of the R & D Center and I/D/E/A may be advantageous and disadvantageous. There clearly exist different and sometimes conflicting loyalties among schools and within states, some different training materials and procedures, separate guidelines and definitions, and different installation frameworks -- and thus the need for integrating philosophies and procedures is underscored. On the other hand, the ultimate purposes of individualized education are virtually the same and there have already been many instances of cooperative endeavor in the separate installation projects of the two organizations. If it is not feasible to study these relationships further and merge efforts, resources, and materials, then it is strongly recommended that only one installation model be promoted and followed.

8. There appear to be several advantages in carrying out the installation effort through coordinators at the state level and by means of state

and district written agreements. Within this framework, however, it is recommended that--to the extent possible--the role of the state coordinator as an individual be defined so as to cover such matters as responsibilities, relationships with schools, authority, communication, and feedback. Some coordinators have had most demanding jobs to fulfill, while others have devoted less energy and imagination. There have also been different levels of response to requests for feedback to the R & D Center as well as varying perceptions of what the coordinator can or should accomplish. Equally important, it has not been clear what degree of "authority" the coordinator has over local decisions or plans, and thus the matter of quality control is in doubt. In any case, a role definition would be a boon to all concerned, especially if it also provided for consistent functions across the states.

9. Typically, the state department of education has been the implementation agency in the 1971-72 effort. In the interests of communication, efficiency, and provision of resources, further consideration might be given to making formal arrangements with city, university, and county agencies as well.

10. If training materials are an essential element rather than an optional kind of assistance, then they need to be good enough that all will use them. If films are dismissed as ideal, or booklets are distributed casually, or guides are employed only minimally, then the practical value of the training materials is consequently diminished. As new materials are developed, consideration might be given to a careful survey of practitioners' reactions and needs.

11. Similarly, if the training materials are requisite (in theory or reality) to effective implementation, then it must be assured that all school staffs have and use them. For schools to proceed without them, or with limited use of them, appears unwise.

12. Equal or at least minimum access to materials, training assistance, consultants, and other resources needs somehow to be provided within and across states. While a school's optional use of the whole realm of resources may certainly be acceptable, the problem has been the existence of very different degrees of access. Coordinators (state, university, and district) have sometimes been unresponsive to school requests for assistance; some training materials have been available only on loan and at the state level;

finances have prohibited attendance at important training opportunities, have limited or denied inservice activities, and have affected the use of consultants; linkage groups have not been easily available to all schools and have had very different sorts of programs; members of the R & D Center installation team have visited some but not all schools; a number of schools have been psychologically and geographically isolated; and curriculum materials from various sources have not always been available for IGE programing. It is recommended that the whole area of resources be studied, guidelines be set up for minimum access, and further, that guarantees of such access be required at the time formal agreements are arranged. This might approximate some sort of screening of schools.

13. It is recommended that a study of continuity be conducted in order to follow schools beyond the first year of activity. This might include longitudinal study of selected schools over a span of years. Such a study might answer questions like these: once installed, are schools irreversibly committed to the patterns? to what extent do the first year's 200 to 225 schools refine operations, survive difficulties, maintain momentum? do the schools move closer to the classical MUSE and IGE models, or do several models emerge? if the latter, how are these judged? what sorts of continuing assistance do schools need, or can most be expected to proceed on their own after the first year? Since the first year effort was, at all levels, a pilot effort so far as widespread installation is concerned, these questions have more than academic importance. For the same reason it would appear important for the R & D Center and state coordinators to follow and assist the first-year crop of schools even while installing new groups of schools throughout the country.

14. The R & D Center and state coordinators have developed many means of communication with the schools. These should be continued (and expanded in some states). Newsletters, outlines, League bulletins and activities, prototypic training materials, schedules, visits, lists of materials, overviews, and so on have provided valuable substantive and moral support for many practitioners. It might be useful for state coordinators to exchange such materials for the sake of sharing their individual approaches and the extension of common philosophies and procedures. If this could be conveniently systematized, it might result in the development of a cohesive installation strategy based upon continuing input from a variety of sources.

15. It is recommended that linkage groups be further encouraged, especially on a regional basis within states. While such groups (leagues, pacts,

networks) were not an integral part of the installation model, they provided important means of planning, problem-solving, communication, and cooperation.

16. In view of several problem-areas noted in the nationwide installation, continued availability of on-site technical assistance should be arranged, of the sort provided to some schools by the R & D Center installation teams. Through some means, such Technical assistance should be made at least available to all schools. These efforts could be directed to the proposed criterion-guideline packages (see recommendation #2), and might embrace a monitoring function as well as provide assistance in the use of training and curricular materials.

17. The existing specific implementation criteria might be even more useful if the responsibilities of staff teachers and principals were spelled out separately for people in those positions. At present, the guidelines detail the unit and unit leader roles with little precise mention of the staff teacher; similarly, many presumed aspects of the principal's role are subsumed in the IIC activities.

18. It is recommended that "inservice training" be defined, required, and monitored so that it becomes a consistent part of the overall training design. (Certain activities which some considered to be inservice would not be accepted by others, and indeed many schools had little or no such additional preparation). Minimum standards would be needed in order to assure the benefits potentially inherent in systematic inservice programs.

SUMMARY OF PROJECT OUTCOMES

1. Accounting and process-evaluation of national and state-level installation procedures; schools involved; training provided and undertaken; basic implementation practices in the first few months; and accounting of detailed implementation practices at year-end in a sample of schools.

2. Derivation of feedback on numerous MUSE and IGE implementation practices at the school level, some after 4 to 5 months and some at the end of the first installation year.

3. Development of survey and detailed instruments, and visit report forms, now available for adaptation or direct use by personnel at all levels.

4. Provision, during the visits, of feedback to school staffs and consulting on curriculum programs, common implementation problems, behavioral objectives, and local evaluation.

5. Periodic feedback to state coordinators on visit findings and accounting discrepancies, and discussion of general evaluation practices.

6. Preparation of case studies of implementation practices in several schools.

7. Normative data on school-level implementation status after several months; on a sample of schools at end of first year.

8. Reactions of school personnel to training events, training needs, MUSE/IGE concepts; and their advice to others planning MUSE/IGE installation.

9. Report of the frequency of important implementation problems at the school level.

10. Report of early indications of impact (at school and district levels) which may suggest areas for further examination and expectations for newly installing schools.

11. Provision, to a sample of schools, of the means by which they might examine their own status and progress, and explore their local implementation dynamics near the end of the first year (through completion of the detailed questionnaires).

12. Conclusions and recommendations as to national and state installation practices, and implementation at the school level.

CHAPTER II

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Instruments were developed for four purposes. A survey instrument was prepared for administration to principals of all schools newly installing MUSE/IGE in the 1971-72 school year. Another survey questionnaire was developed for a representative of each district with new MUSE/IGE schools. The third was a report form for use after site visits were completed at MUSE/IGE schools and for their formal inservice training sessions. The last instrument is more properly called a set of questionnaires; these were sent, at the same time, to various categories of persons covering the complete staffs of sixty schools selected as a sample for study.

In a sense, instrument development began with OE's Request for proposal. The process of internalizing the whole domain of MUSE/IGE history, purposes, criteria, and alternatives--and also of establishing lines of contact and communication--in order to prepare the proposal and initiate the project... all of this also served as important background in the process of developing meaningful survey and detailed content. The resources studied at the outset of our activity, and also during the opening months, have been outlined in Chapter I.

Administration as an Aspect of Development

The survey instruments for the schools and districts were first administered at the end of January (1972). The report forms for site visits at schools were used throughout the school year, commencing in October. And the set of questionnaires for the sample of schools was initially mailed toward the end of April. These dates provide a framework for understanding the schedule by which the instruments were developed. The visit report forms stood pretty much by themselves, although of course they were intended to record information potentially useful in setting questionnaire content.

But the questionnaires were temporally related: the January forms were survey instruments for all schools and one purpose was to set the stage for (and provide certain bases for) the later detailed instrument sent to the subsample. Moreover, there were two other general but very important schedule considerations. One was the period needed for study, preliminary try-out, review, pretest, and revision. The second was the formal review and

approval process (within the Office of Education and the Office of Management and Budget), which typically requires about two months.

The interaction of these various elements--with both their opportunities and their constraints--resulted in the final schedule of development and administration. It was necessary to allow for all these considerations:

1. Development time sufficient for a thorough understanding of MUSE/IGE purposes and processes
2. Sufficient time for meaningful tryout and review, and also for formal approval
3. First questionnaire administered far enough into the installation period so that training could be accounted for and so that basic MUSE/IGE steps would have been initiated
4. First questionnaire administered late enough in the year to permit polling schools which installed in the second semester and--as it turned out--quite late in the second semester
5. First questionnaire administered soon enough before the second to provide a "rest" for the responding schools... as well as an opportunity for us to study the first returns while completing development of the second instrument
6. Administration of the second questionnaire to the spring group late enough for them to have gotten well into implementation, but soon enough not to conflict with end-of-year pressures at the schools
7. The need for followup activities in relation to all administrations.

It was possible to adhere to these requirements. However, even with follow-up efforts, some returns from the first questionnaire trickled in throughout the spring, and indeed, several of the subsample schools responded to the detailed questionnaire well into June. Thus the schedule for analysis was also affected.

The Visit Report Forms

These two forms (see Appendix G) were constructed as vehicles for reporting site-visit observations, findings, and unanswered questions. Although the visits and interviews were unstructured, the record forms were fairly detailed.

The first was concerned with observation at the school on a normal instructional day, and outlined the following broad topics:

-Interviews (with whom and for how long)
-Materials studied and/or included as part of report
-Meetings attended
-Facilities observed (building, library, unit arrangements)
-Activities observed (library, classroom instruction, other)
-Topics to be followed up on later visit

The instrument also contained a long list of questions for the visitor to use as a further guide in interviews and observation. These, plus internal memoranda and the record forms themselves, covered the purposes and helped to make the visits standard within schools and across schools.

As can be seen, the instrument was meant to serve as a basis for conducting a subsequent visit at the same school, and this accounts for some of the detail required. For example, knowing who was interviewed, which unit's meeting was observed, what materials were obtained, and what particular questions seemed unresolved would constitute the starting point for the person making the second or third visit.

The second instrument was developed for recording observations at scheduled formal inservice activities for the whole school staff. It outlined topics covered, methods employed, purposes, outcomes, leadership, and attendance. These were all presumed to be of importance in summarizing inservice activities across all schools, above and beyond merely indicating that it had occurred.

Clearly, the content and outlines of these two report forms reflect the biases of the developer, which in turn were based on the implementation plans and criteria of the sponsoring agencies. The instruments were prepared very early in the school year, after a certain amount of background work had been accomplished, but before site visits were begun. They served the visit purposes adequately, and accordingly were not revised.

The First Questionnaire - Principals

This survey instrument, intended for principals of all schools installing in 1971-72, had two fundamental purposes: to record the extent of training undertaken by school staffs, and to discover in a general way to what extent basic implementation activities had been initiated. (Appendix A contains this instrument).

It was of course necessary to consult every available resource in order to determine which training activities were "required" or expected, which were optional, which were the most likely to have been attended by a sizable group of school people, which ones were intended for what special

groups, and so on, and to determine specific dates and places where appropriate. It would be an understatement to say that this posed a challenge. We consulted the Wisconsin R & D Center, I/D/E/A, state coordinators, newsletters, records, and school people in determining the best list of training activities. (By so doing, we were able to include specialized workshops for school leaders up to the one held in January 1972). The next step was to attempt to call them by standard names or to define them clearly enough to overcome ambiguity. We discovered a considerable degree of variation among states, and a confusing array of terms and purposes. Surely some school people would be dismayed at the number of training events we had to list in order to cover the diversity. We attempted to explain this, of course, in the cover letter to principals.

An added consideration was that training and implementation overlapped to an extent. For example, attendance at the Staff Development Workshop (or Principal-Unit Leader Conference, as it was also called) constituted an aspect of training. But if the school leaders actually made plans and decisions at that time, then implementation steps were being carried out. This overlapping was even more true of the Preschool Workshop (originally called the Pre-Installation Workshop), since it was indeed a training session but also included the setting-up of units, unit meetings, and in some schools was the vehicle for beginning IGE processes in instructional programing. As a result, the first questionnaire purposefully included checklist items to record attendance at training sessions; but it also encompassed separate pages devoted to some detail concerning the Staff Development Workshop, the Preschool Workshop, and formal inservice training.

"Training" was generalized to include use of various film and print materials, training and exposure opportunities offered by district or state groups, contact with state coordinator, and employment of an implementation guide.

The more involved aspect of the job was development of items related to the basic steps of installation in the schools. Again, all sorts of resources proved helpful. In particular, three series of visits were of inestimable value: visits to staffs of three 1970-71 schools in August, attendance at five Preschool Workshops, and scheduled site-visits to 16 schools in October/November. These set the stage for realistic expectations of what steps might be taken by schools within the first few months. At the same time, the extent of variation in practice also became apparent, and items had to be framed in such a way as to answer all situations. This resulted in over-

definition in some items and lack of precision in others. It also meant that some items were of necessity openended and that in some cases explanations had to be provided along with the questions.

It was our task to select topics for the "basic steps" domain. Both the R & D Center and I/D/E/A, of course, had implementation guides, but the two differed considerably. And neither one--at the time of our development work--had ordered the myriad steps onto a sequenced time-line or into a priority listing. Moreover, even the initial steps of implementation had not been isolated; thus, an easy checklist of "progress" steps or minimal indicators was not available. (In this connection, R & D Center staff did outline to state coordinators four absolute criteria for defining an acceptable implementation start; these were enumerated at a meeting early in February). Both organizations were in the process of refining their criteria. In the case of the R & D Center, the implementation objectives were so numerous that it would be a major undertaking to order them by sequence or importance--and indeed too tight ordering might hamper the whole purpose by ignoring school differences and the need for flexibility.

At that time it appeared that the criteria were viewed as equally important. So it was necessary to choose what appeared to us to be basic elements in implementation. The questionnaire reflects these decisions, showing emphasis on the Instructional Improvement Committee, the unit structure, multiaging, library/IMC, parent information efforts, IGE subject-areas, and district relationships.

An additional topic was included, one that might be perceived as unexpected. Advice was offered that there would be very few impacts in the first year, but we decided to develop an item asking about first-year effects. This was done in order to tap outcomes or impacts (either positive or negative) which accompanied the introduction of the new patterns. Especially since this instrument was the only one going to all schools, it seemed worthwhile to try to answer the questions "What is different now?" and "What difference has it made?" above and beyond the fact that the model had been installed.

All questionnaire content, of course, was subject to review. Review materials were sent to the OE project officer, R & D Center staff, and state coordinators, with a request for feedback, revisions, and suggestions. The project officer had very meaningful input, and several coordinators went out of their way to study and review the instrument. Pretesting was

accomplished by asking a number of principals and unit leaders--who had installed MUSE/IGE in 1970-71--to complete the instrument, fill out an evaluation form, and make marginal notes. Nine principals and eight unit leaders responded; all were from Colorado or Wisconsin and had been contacted through the courtesy of the state coordinators. The total pretest and review activity resulted in numerous deletions, clarifications, and editorial revisions, and certainly reflected the reactions and preferences of people directly involved in installation.

A major concern--of developers and reviewers--was to keep the instrument brief. From the outset this meant the exclusion of items which would be of definite interest and utility, but which were expendable. Just one example: we learned that staff members had attended training sessions outside the purview of the R & D Center and state coordinators. But these workshops were germane to MUSE/IGE purposes--individualized math programs, seminars on continuous progress methods, workshops on team teaching, and so on. We had to reject such "related but unrelated" training from the lists of activities attended. On the other hand, a few items were deferred for incorporation into the second questionnaire.

In sum, development posed certain problems and forced certain decisions, and the outcome may not have been satisfactory to all concerned. In any event, there is likely a relationship between a first-year nationwide installation effort and any instruments designed to describe or document that effort. From one point of view, the instrument may therefore have appeared too static, in view of the changing plans, activities, and criteria of the implementing agencies. From another, it may have seemed too tentative or sketchy. But from yet another viewpoint, the questionnaire itself may be viewed as developmental and in need of revision prior to additional use with new groups of schools. In particular, we regret that it was not possible to point it very clearly to specific minimal installation criteria, and likewise it is not possible to draw firm conclusions about installation progress or even status. These are matters of interpretation, however, and are treated in some detail in Chapter III.

The First Questionnaire - District Representatives

The preceding discussion applies equally to this instrument, in virtually all particulars. The school district from the outset was viewed as

an important facilitant in MUSE/IGE installation, and thus a separate questionnaire was developed. District representatives were to be a link in the training chain, and polling them would also allow certain conclusions about the apparent climate for change within the district. (See Appendix C).

This instrument was intended for one person (at the district level) for each of the 1971-72-installing schools. Thus the items concerned themselves with participation in training, assistance provided to the "new" schools, commitment, and policies governing certain facets of installation.

Aside from coordinators and the OE project officer, supervisors or superintendents from 9 districts assisted in review, pretesting, and revision.

The Second Questionnaire - for School Staffs

Fundamentally the same background was utilized for this instrument as for the first questionnaire. However, since development covered a longer period, it was possible to draw on the second set of site-visits, on continued contact with R & D staff and state coordinators, and on a growing sense of the dymanics of the installation process. In addition, it was possible to study first questionnaire returns. The second instrument (see Appendix E) was directed to various populations in a subsample of 60 schools. These were:

1. Principal
2. All teachers (individually)
3. Librarian/IMC director
4. IGE subject-area specialist
5. The IIC (as a team)
6. Each unit (as a team)

In addition, a 2-page questionnaire was sent to a district representative.

The purpose at this time was to get much closer to the facts of actual implementation throughout a school. As the first instrument was a survey form, this set of questionnaires was more diagnostic of progress, problems, plans, attitudes, and the dynamics of the installation process. For that reason, different individuals and groups were contacted, as had been intended from the outset. Beyond getting in touch with the full staff of each school, this approach had an added advantage: it was possible to ask a variety of questions and to cover much more ground than would have been feasible in an instrument directed to just one person.

Pretesting was done with the help of a few principals, teachers, and IIC groups in five 1971-72 schools which were not selected for the sub-sample study--and also in a few 1970-71 schools. As before, review packets were sent to staff at the R & D Center and to the several state coordinators. School personnel were most helpful in their candid responses and evaluations, and two coordinators in particular assisted in refinement, location, and/or deletion of items. Those two persons commented especially about the greater potential usefulness of the findings because the items were much more detailed than for the first instrument.

That last point bears on the most difficult part of development. Just as was true earlier, the question was, "What are the crucial activities, the criteria of greatest importance?" If indeed we were to learn about implementation in detail, then items would have to be carefully prepared and judiciously selected.

At this time, R & D Center staff had just enunciated four minimal conditions which schools must satisfy. These were that a) the school be fully unitized, b) all units be multiaged, c) there be an active IIC, and d) one IGE subject be taught according to the instructional programing model. This provided impetus for the selection of 12 basic areas to be examined through the whole set of instruments, and in turn those 12 areas covered a large proportion of the separate implementation objectives contained in the R & D guide. Those criteria in their various editions were carefully studied and built into the items in a number of ways.

We in no way attempted to include all the criteria, however. The main reason for this was that there was no direct guidance as to which objectives had priority, and by then it had become obvious that the criteria were viewed more as outcomes at the end of 2 or 3 years--rather than inputs necessary to starting the installation process. Moreover, even in the latest edition, the criteria were introduced with the suggestion that implementation goals would be achieved through "utilizing all or most of the practices and procedures contained in these performance objectives."

Thus, on the basis of interpreting all available sources, the 12 topical areas were chosen for inclusion in these instruments. Accordingly, the instruments were built on certain educated presuppositions concerning what practices should or might obtain in the sample of schools. The 12 areas were:

1. School has an active IIC
2. School follows instructional programing model in one subject
3. School is fully unitized
4. Students are multiaged within units
5. School makes use of many resources in fostering MUSE/IGE
6. School has differentiated staff functions
7. Teamwork works in the units
8. There is effective unit leadership
9. The level of commitment by teachers is high
10. Communications within the school are open
11. The library/IMC is well-stocked and well-used
12. Principal is an effective leader and catalyst

No attempt was made to give these topics equal weight in developing items or in projecting interpretation. Similarly, no attempt was made to order them in importance, except that the first four mentioned are the particular areas outlined by R & D Center staff members.

In addition to items bearing on the 12 areas, a few were included for their feedback value to coordinators (for example, the principal's view of the most pressing personnel problems, and the IIC's report on the use of IGE training materials during the year).

C H A P T E R I I I

THE SCHOOL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaires received from principals of all responding schools are discussed in this chapter. There are two main sections, first the Introduction and then the Findings.

The Introduction describes background and procedure, but is concerned primarily with an accounting of the numbers of questionnaires sent, received, and used in analysis.

The section on Findings analyzes responses to each questionnaire item and refers to the tables located in Appendix B. In most cases discussion is called for beyond mere explication, and in some other instances interpretation is also provided. Interpretation, of course, does not strictly belong in a findings section, but, because there are so many findings, it seemed best to discuss some topics in depth contiguously to the findings related to them.

The Findings are treated under the headings outlined on the next page; each heading is followed by the Questionnaire item numbers included in that category.

Background of Total Group of Schools

- Description of Schools (1)
- Commitment to MUSE/IGE (2)
- History of Innovative Practices (3)

Basic Practices Related to MUSE/IGE Installation

- Instructional Improvement Committee (9)
- Units and Unit Organization (12)
- IGE Subject Areas (12)

Extent of Training and Exposure to MUSE/IGE Concepts

- The Standard Set of Five Conferences (15)
- Specific Stated Workshops at Particular Locations (16)
- Miscellaneous Opportunities for Training (17)
- Summary

Resources and Assistance Available and Made Use Of

- Print and Film Materials (11,13)
- The State Coordinator (8)
- District and Linkage Groups (5,6,7)

Staff Development Workshop for Principal, Unit Leaders (18)

Preschool Workshop for School Staff (19)

Formal Inservice Training for School Staff (20)

Other Areas of Interest or Concern

- Library, Media Center, or IMC (10)
- Informing and Reminding Parents (4)
- Group Reactions (14)
- Impacts (21)

THE SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

The questionnaire prepared for school principals focused on two major areas of concern. The first was an accounting of the school staff's participation in the formal training chain which had been set up by the Wisconsin R & D Center and the state coordinators. The second purpose was to describe implementation status and progress in terms of several basic installation activities. For both purposes, it appeared feasible and desirable to contact only the school principal, although some additional and overlapping information was also sought from district personnel (see Chapter IV).

Since this first questionnaire was the only means of getting data from all the schools, it was decided to expand the two purposes into more than simple checklists for training and installation practices. Thus, for certain training events (preschool workshop, staff development training), principals were asked to provide some detail concerning the nature of the workshop. And for certain basic elements in installation (for example, the IIC and the use of people and materials as resources), enough detail was obtained to make the yes-no responses more meaningful. This seemed particularly important since from the outset it was anticipated that schools would have quite different practices, problems, approaches, and purposes.

In addition to the two major topics of this questionnaire, information was also sought concerning these other matters of interest or importance:

1. Background and descriptive information about the school
2. Gross attitudes of various groups involved
3. Notable impacts within the first few months
4. Reactions to certain of the training events
5. Informational activities directed to the school's parents

As indicated earlier, a number of means were employed in determining content for this instrument. This included pretesting and review by school principals, state coordinators, site visitors, and consultants. The instrument is a general, or gross, one in that it sought mostly the basic facts of implementation and training without getting indications of the dynamics

involved. It is a survey questionnaire neither suited to making fine distinctions nor sensitive to the attitudes of school principals.

Questionnaires were mailed to principals as follows: February 1, for schools installing in the fall of 1971; April 1, for schools installing in spring 1972; and May 1, for schools in New Jersey. (New Jersey's installation plans called for multiunit and IGE changes to occur in the schools in the middle of the second semester). Thus it is clear that while responses are treated as though they represent a single population, principals completed the instrument after varying numbers of months into the installation process. The great bulk of them, however, responded after about 5 months of MUSE/IGE activity during the 1971-72 school year.

Bases for the mailing lists were the R & D Center's directory along with rosters supplied by state (and city) coordinators. Every effort was made to keep posted on changes in the lists and to have "pure" information. Several coordinators supplied updated rosters as late as January; these reflected corrected addresses as well as additions and deletions.

After one month, a follow-up copy of the instrument was mailed to all non-responding principals. We estimate that this effort brought in about 15% of the full number of completed questionnaires.

A total of 227 responses was received directly from principals. As indicated in Table P-1 (see Appendix B for all tables relating to the principals' instrument), however, not all of these were usable. Alltold, 22 were discounted, for these reasons: 20 principals indicated (on the form or with a note) that their schools either would not be implementing until September 1972--or had done so prior to the 1971-72 school year. One principal replied that her school was not involved in MUSE/IGE at all; and another return was voided. As to the first two categories, we took the principals' replies at face value, and they were automatically excluded from analysis. However, many of them actually completed parts of the instrument.

Table P-1 shows, then, a total of 205 completed responses used in all later analysis and interpretation. Furthermore, it shows responses by fall and spring semester, and by state. Entries in all categories above the heavy line represent the 205 responses treated in the analysis. Percentages are also indicated for total and semester; thus 84% of the usable returns are from schools installing in fall 1971 and the other 16% represent schools installing in spring 1972.

How good was this return? Based upon the total number of questionnaires mailed (287), which in turn was based upon rosters supplied by several sources, the 227 responses represent a 79% return. As surveys go, this is perhaps a little above what might be expected. Of course, these were schools involved in a stated pattern of installation and they were committed--informally through their districts--to participate in various evaluation efforts. Considering the usable responses, however (205 of 287 mailed), results in a 71% return.

The chart below indicates the number of schools to which instruments were sent, and summarizes the number from which replies were obtained as well as the usable returns. States are indicated by the "state numbers" which are used throughout the analysis and discussion. Lincoln, Nebraska and the San Mateo area of California are treated as "one state," for convenience only. These two areas received the first questionnaire but were not asked to participate in other aspects of the total project; this was mainly because state-level agreements were not involved.

State and Number	Number Sent	Number Received	Number Usable
1. Colorado	30	28	28
2. Connecticut	23	21	21
3. Illinois	50	35	28
4. Minnesota	23	20	18
5. Ohio	21	19	13
6. South Carolina	20	17	17
7. Wisconsin	57	48	46
8. Indiana	19	14	13
9. New Jersey	20	15	11
10. Lincoln, Neb.	9	7	7
San Mateo, Cal.	15	3	3
Totals	287	227	205

Between 227 received and 287 sent remain 50 schools unaccounted for. Most of these were not heard from or about, but we can account for some. While responses from district personnel confirmed a number of the installation dates indicated by principals (either before or after the 1971-72 school year), a few districts in one state supplied information in cases where the principal did not reply. Thus 5 more schools were shown to plan installation in September 1972, and 3 others were reported not involved in MUSE/IGE at all. And two non-responding schools were included on the visit schedule and were found to be 1971-72 installers.

Beyond this there was also a little confusion. Among schools whose responses are involved in the 227 figure, one principal indicated installation in 9-71, but his district representative wrote that the implementation

was so minor as not to be counted until the fall of 1972! In another instance, the district liaison included a school as a 1971-72 implementer, but the principal indicated--as did our abortive visit--that the school has no involvement in the MUSE/IGE patterns. Again, a principal and district person agreed, in writing, on second semester installation, but later the principal suggested that his school would not be "in" until next fall. Finally, one principal disagreed with himself. Asked about date of "becoming multiunit/IGE school" in the questionnaire, he indicated second semester. But he attached a note which clearly outlined plans for implementation in September 1972.

Overall, these cases were few. But they do make it difficult to account for the schools actually installing MUSE/IGE in the 1971-72 school year. By our reckoning, 33 schools might be considered "mistakes" out of a total of 287 which various rosters indicated for inclusion. All states except California and Nebraska are represented by these 33 schools, though three-fourths of them are in just three states. The chart below describes the four categories of "misfit." The 33 schools amount to 12% of the total (287) to which questionnaires were sent. There is no way of knowing how many other schools might fall into these categories among those 40 we never heard from or about.

Reason	Number
1967, 1968, 1969 implementation	3
1970, Jan. 1971 "	8
Installation planned for 9-72	18
Not involved in MUSE/IGE at all	4
	33

This sort of mismatch in figures is perhaps not unexpected. A number of schools (and districts) came late into the innovative patterns, and this may account for an on-paper indication of installation with actual implementation planned for a later date. It may be that this circumstance explains a number of the non-responses. On the other hand, there appears to be a fair amount of confusion in various sorts of records, as indicated for example in Tables D-2 and D-3. The first shows the degree of disparity between schools' and districts' listings of names and dates, while the second indicates a much greater degree of error between district rosters and those of the state coordinators and the R & D Center.

This whole matter should perhaps be approached from one more point of view. We have so far dealt with it in terms of responses made to these two questionnaire items:

> District: "Which elementary (or middle) schools are new multiunit/IGE schools in your district this year?
>
> Principal: "School became multiunit/IGE school in (Sept. '71), (Jan/Feb 72), or (Other_____)."

On the basis of these, plus letters received and visits made, the extent of disparity in records has been discussed above. However, another instrument suggests a different source of potential confusion about installation dates--as viewed by the principals themselves. The second questionnaire (sent to a sample of schools) included this item for principals:

> "How do you define the 'beginning point' of your installation of MUSE/IGE this year? That is, what event or circumstance marks the point...after which you would say that your school was actually a MUSE/IGE school?"

Twelve options were listed--some specifically related to multiunit structure, others to commitment, and others to IGE instructional programing. Alltold, 51 principals completed this item, with 45 indicating a single response as asked for. Including entries under "other," there were 14 different answers checked, ranging from "Decision by school staff to be committed to MUSE/IGE" to "Initial training for the principal" to "First regular IIC meeting" to "Assessment of pupil status in the IGE subject." (This item will be more fully discussed in Chapter V). In other words, principals marked as the starting point certain events which other principals considered to be prior to initiation or after initiation. The beginning point (or installation or implementation) is not clearly defined. By the criterion of COMMITMENT, we might find all 287 schools have passed the point of initiation; but by a criterion of OPERATION OF IGE VIA THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMING MODEL, that number might be reduced by half so far as 1971-72 is concerned.

A careful extension of the findings from a sample of 45 principals to the total of 287 schools listed as "installed" suggests that considerable variation exists in definitions, beginning points, and awareness of what precisely is involved in making a changeover to becoming a MUSE/IGE school.

Given all the considerations discussed above, it does not appear possible to answer the question: how many schools installed MUSE/IGE in 1971-72? Suffice it to say that 205 principals indicated such installation in their questionnaire responses, and that likely a good proportion of the 50 non-responders also would fall into this category. We know--through the

several information sources already outlined--that at least 33 of 287 schools do not appear to be 1971-72 installers and can equally surmise that a portion of the non-responders would appear likewise. In any event, there is good reason to imagine a fair amount of indefiniteness on this whole question. To be listed as a MUSE/IGE school is one thing, but to actually make changes and start the process is many things.

> As a way of summarizing all schools contacted, completed questionnaires, schools visited, and apparent correct "installation date," Appendix H lists each school separately, by state. Coordinators and others may find these of value as well as interest.

Findings

Questionnaire findings for 205 schools are presented in Appendix B, Tables P-1 to P-92. Explanatory and interpretative notes are provided here, with reference to the tables. In all entries for the total (national) group and for the first vs second semester groups, both actual numbers and percentages are entered. In a few instances percentages are omitted from the columns pertaining to the states, where the numbers alone deserve emphasis.

The tables are set up so that a given response alternative to an item can be read from left to right through national, semester, and then state columns. The states are entered by code numbers, as listed below:

1. Colorado	4. Minnesota	7. Wisconsin
2. Connecticut	5. Ohio	8. Indiana
3. Illinois	6. South Carolina	9. New Jersey

10. California and Nebraska combined

Percentage entries are always made in terms of the particular group reported in a given column; in this way, separate state entries will likely be most meaningful to coordinators or others. It is of course possible to contrast any state's percentage on a given item with percentages listed for other states, semester total, and national group.

A word about the breakdown by semesters is in order here. Some schools (32, or 16% of the 205 responses treated here) indicated that installation began in the second semester--January, February, or March of 1972. Because this was some 5 months after the other 173 schools in the total group, it was conjectured that meaningful differences might appear between semester groups, particularly with respect to basic installation activities accomplished by mid-year. This would seem also to apply to training opportunities taken advantage of. Indeed there were several such differences (in percentage terms) although fewer than had been anticipated.

Noting that an N of 32 spring-semester schools is relatively small, we judged a difference of 20 percentage points to be a useful criterion for entering responses by semester. Where such differences obtain, they are entered in the tables and discussed in the text. Where percentages are not shown for the first and second semesters, the reader may infer that they are close to one another and thus approximate those percentages entered for the total group of 205 schools.

Number of "omits" is entered in the tables at the total-group level; where there are six or more, entries are then also made by state to show distribution of omits. There are some instances where the number is very large (for example, because of a large number of "no" answers to a previous item), and this is clarified in the text discussion.

The reader is reminded that responses to questionnaire items were made about half a year into the implementation schedule. Some 85% of the instruments were completed in the 6th month after presumed initiation of installation, and the remainder anywhere from 2 to 4 months into reported implementation.

In this connection, it should be noted that the masterplan for New Jersey (with 11 schools in the total treatment group) called for intensive second-semester planning, preparation, and practice, but that many schools would not begin IGE instructional programing in a subject area until the fall of 1972. So far as we could determine, this was also true of several schools (in other states) which reported first-semester installation. A number of schools, in other words, began with the MUSE organizational structure--intending to add IGE instruction at a later date; in some locations, the opposite order was the pattern. In still others--as determined by visits, questionnaire responses, letters, and information from coordinators--both MUSE and IGE were instituted at roughly the same time (earlier or later in the school year) but at widely varying levels of completeness and adherence to implementation criteria. These comments put us right back at the nexus of the problem, so far as accounting is concerned: there is no clear starting point which applies to all schools. Thus, in order to treat the data in feasible fashion, it was necessary to ignore these variations.

Background of Total Group of Schools

(A) Description of Schools. All types of locations listed in the questionnaire were represented by schools involved, as reported in Table P-2.

Suburban areas and small cities (up to 50,000) together accounted for over half the total. The next largest category was large cities (with 16%), though this does not indicate number in center-city areas. Site-visit information and other contacts suggest that a very small number of schools are in center-city urban locations, perhaps no more than ten. The two rural categories (rural area and rural near city) together accounted for one-fifth of the schools, however, with the remainder in medium-sized cities. In all, the breakdown in rough proportions is this:

Cities.....25%	Towns.....25%
Suburbs.....25%	Rural Areas...25%

The only notable variation among states was that no school in Minnesota was located in a medium-sized or large city, while all schools in Indiana were located in one large city, Indianapolis.

Table P-3 reports on predominant socio-economic levels represented by school populations. Two-thirds indicated middle-class, with 7% reporting upper-class and 23% reporting lower. The upper-class schools were located in 5 of the 10 states, while both other categories were represented in all 10 states.

The 1971-72 schools varied in size from 100 students to over 1200. As shown in Table P-4, over half the schools fell into the range of 301 to 600, but every other classification (from under 150 pupils to over 1200) also was reported, in increments of 150 students. No state had entries in every category, however, but the overall range within states was always greater than 750 pupils. The very small or very large size of a school apparently has not had a restrictive bearing upon the decision to move into MUSE/IGE patterns, although future feedback may suggest problems at either end of the scale. Visits have been made at the very large and very small, and the second questionnaire similarly taps practices in both sorts of schools. These will be discussed separately in later chapters.

As to the nature of the present building, Table P-5 reports over half to be separate classrooms opening onto hallways--with "classrooms and open space", "open space only", and "some movable walls", in descending order of frequency. An "other" category accounted for just 3% of the responses. Again, it appears obvious that the "traditional" nature of the building did not have an adverse effect upon moving toward MUSE/IGE,

although there are some indications that such structures have hampered communication, team efforts, and effective IGE instruction. A number of schools have by now removed walls or constructed doorways to solve emerging problems. But, as will be discussed later, some teachers in open-space schools have found it helpful to close off their spaces.

While 47% of first-semester schools had the traditional building, 81% of second-semester schools had separate classrooms "down the hallway." This is the first instance where a percentage difference between semesters appeared worthy of note. As can be seen, the traditional sort of building was very much in the majority in Indiana and New Jersey.

As might be expected, the grade-range of newly-installed schools was reported to cover a large number of combinations. Kindergarten-to-grade-6 was the most frequent (51%), as detailed in Table P-6. The other thirteen combinations accounted for from 1% to 10% of the total each, with 2% in an "other" category. Of some interest is the number of schools (23) which extend to grade 8--though not all of these indicated that the 7th and 8th graders were involved in MUSE/IGE--and also the number of schools (12) with a range of only 2 or 3 grade levels. Most schools, however, reported kindergarten to grade 4, 5, or 6, or other combinations with a range of 5 or 6 grades. (Grade-range was selected as the reporting basis since it could most consistently be derived from various sources within the questionnaire).

A perhaps surprising number of principals reported that they were not principals of their present schools last year (see Table P-7). Some 17% fell into this category. This has some import since presumably most principals and staffs were ideologically committed to the innovative patterns during last school year, and continuity would be desirable. These 35 principals were located in all states except New Jersey (where all commitments took place in 1971-72 anyway). A number of principals wrote in notes to the effect that theirs were new buildings (to explain why they could not answer certain items). We studied these and determined that 11 schools were newly organized (that is, new staffs, students bodies, and buildings were developed) for the 1971-72 school year, as shown in Table P-8. We discounted cases where a former school organization moved into a new building. The 11 newly organized schools, then, account for fewer than one-third of the 35 principals who indicated being newly appointed to 1971-72 MUSE/IGE schools.

Finally, we asked principals to indicate how they had first learned about multiunit/IGE concepts. Table P-9 outlines their responses, showing

that the greatest proportion (37%) had attended an overview/introductory meeting. Another 36 (or 18%) had been requested by the District to consider the new patterns, and about 10% had learned about the concepts through professional journals, information provided by the district, or other means.

The breakdown suggests that at least 66% of the first acquaintance came by "accident": journals; information provided by the R & D Center, the state or district; overview meetings; professional meetings. The remainder apparently was through more direct contact: a specified request by the district and acquaintance with an existing MUSE/IGE school. Some schools--in all states but one--were contacted by the district administration, and in 8 states the district apparently distributed general information. On the other hand, in only one state was the state department of education credited with making the patterns known. However, this is no doubt artifactual, since several of the "overview meetings" were advertised and sponsored by the department of education and invitations or announcements were widely distributed. First acquaintance is seldom a matter of record, of course, and many principals may not have accurately recalled their first contact. In any event, it would appear profitable to continue to use a variety of means for promoting the MUSE/IGE innovations.

(B) Commitment to MUSE/IGE. Principals were asked to indicate when their schools were committed to MUSE/IGE for the 1971-72 school year, and also how that commitment came about. Table P-10 lists a fairly wide range of dates from sometime in 1970 to the early months of 1972. Since New Jersey and Indiana are listed strictly as second-semester installers, the reported commitment dates are as might be expected--summer 1971 into winter 1972 (except for 2 Indiana schools which were committed earlier). However, among fall-semester installers, many schools became committed at what might be considered late dates from the standpoint of preparation and training time--53 schools (or 31%) reported their commitment as taking place between July and September 1971. (This figure includes schools in every state considered to be a fall-installer). And 4 others reported an even later commitment. Practices varied from state to state of course, and across districts as well, and indeed some school leaders may have ascertained their staff's personal willingness and may have undertaken their own training at the state level prior to formal signing of an agreement. Of equal note is the total number of schools (119 or 58%) which reported their commitment date as June 1971 or earlier.

An interesting spread of replies describes the means by which commitment took place (see Table P-11). The majority, 56%, indicated that "the school staff had considered the pattern, and volunteered," and this included schools in every state. Another 18% reported that the school had been "selected by the district for this innovation," while yet another 10% became involved as part of a district long-range plan. And 13 principals (or 6%) replied that the commitment was "the principal's decision on his own." Thus, 28% of the schools were directly influenced by district plans or decisions, and another 6% moved toward MUSE/IGE because of the principal's own decision. Visits and other questionnaire information reveal that principals in other schools as well may have committed the school, in effect, without staff participation in the decision. In any event, as reported by principals themselves, teachers and staff members in as many as half the schools obviously did not have a full voice in the commitment.

State departments and coordinators may have had some influence in this matter, although there is no direct evidence. The reader will note that 96% of schools in Colorado, 62% is Ohio, 70% in Nebraska-California, and 76% in South Carolina reportedly became committed through staff involvement and volunteering. In only one of these states were schools committed by the principal's decision alone.

(C) History of Innovative Practices. In an effort to explore the relationship between prior innovative practices and adoption of MUSE/IGE, we asked principals to report on specific school facilities and programs in the recent past. One interesting outcome (see Table P-12) was that fully one-quarter of the schools reported having had only traditional characteristics in the years prior to the 1971-72 school year. This was determined by using the following three elements as criteria (out of twelve provided as a checklist).

1. Departmentalization
2. Library
3. Self-contained instructional classrooms

Thus it can be inferred that these 50 schools (24%) had made a somewhat radical move in adopting MUSE/IGE patterns. Several visit schools were included in this number, and indeed observation and interview corroborated the inference above...at least with respect to those schools visited.

The remaining 155 schools reported having practiced 1 or more of the 9 "innovative" elements in the previous school year. Table P-14 outlines these, and shows that each of the following characteristics was checked by 25% or more of the schools.

1. Multiage grouping for instruction	(34%)
2. Learning resources center or media center	(35%)
3. Individualized curriculum	(34%)
4. Team teaching	(45%)
5. Continuous progress of students	(29%)
6. Differentiated staffing responsibilities	(28%)

The other three elements (ungraded primary or school, use of the Wisconsin Design for reading skill development, and open-classroom concept) were checked by 19%, 11%, and 17% respectively.

Many schools indicated one or two such practices, and others reported several. It appears likely that--even though some 50 traditional schools moved into MUSE/IGE--the previous exploration of newer practices had a strong bearing on the decision made by the other three-fourths of the schools. A number of principals indicated this in marginal notes, and others did so in interviews. To paraphrase the common explanation, "We were looking for a systematic vehicle for improving on the practices we had already adopted...and MUSE/IGE seemed the right vehicle."

Table P-13 shows that a total of 60 schools (or 29%) reported having four or more of the innovative characteristics. These were spread throughout all 10 states, with highest proportions in Ohio, Nebraska-California, and Colorado.

As a sidenote to the apparent receptivity to MUSE/IGE--as indicated by incidence of these innovative or "related" characteristics--the majority of schools indicating a practice in 1970-71 also indicated it for the previous year and even earlier, in the cases of: ungraded primary or school, continuous progress, team teaching, learning center, and individualized curriculum.

Basic Practices Related to MUSE/IGE Installation

Three major areas are treated here, covering school organization, unit organization, and practices in the IGE individualized curriculum areas.

(A) The Instructional Improvement Committee (IIC). A fundamental organizational structure in MUSE is the IIC, composed most frequently of the principal and unit leaders. In answer to the question, "Does the school have

an IIC?" 94% of the principals replied "yes" and 6% "no." (See Table P-15). The percentage breakdown is exactly the same for both fall and spring groups. What is notable is that 10 of the 12 "no" responses came from schools indicating fall semester installation; while in both states that are completely spring installers, 100% of the principals indicated that the IIC had been organized.

Table P-16 reports on IIC size and shows that over 50% of schools have 4, 5, or 6 persons as permanent regular IIC members. Overall, IIC's had anywhere from 2 to 10 or more members. Since unit leaders make up the largest part of the IIC membership, the numbers here relate fairly closely to school size. The existence of 7 IIC's with two members, and 28 with 3 members, reflects the number of small schools involved which have just 1 or 2 units.

The composition of the IIC is explored further in Table P-17. Installation criteria list principal and unit leaders as the standard members, but many schools have included staff teachers, counselors, special education teachers, specialists, and librarians as regular permanent members. About 35% of schools had IIC members other than principal and unit leaders with an emphasis (44 schools, or 22%) on the librarian/IMC director. (One school reported its total staff of 9 as composing the IIC). Not shown in the table are the very few cases where membership included district specialist, aides, student teachers, and (in 2 schools) union representatives.

Table P-20 shows that in 84% of schools the principal was the chairman of the IIC. Allowing for 9% non-response, there were 15 schools in all which had either an assistant principal, unit leader, special education teacher, or staff teacher as the IIC chairman. This also is different from the R & D Center installation guidelines, but visit interviews suggested that a few principals found it expedient to encourage a chairman other than themselves.

Two additional questions were asked in order to get a sense of IIC active-ness, one concerned with regular meeting hours and the other with agendas and logs. Allowing for schools without IIC's and principals who omitted the question on meeting hours (a total of 19 omits here), the remaining 186 schools reported from NONE to 4 hours for regularly scheduled weekly meetings. The largest proportion, 45%, reported a one-hour meeting, and this covers schools in all ten states. These findings are shown in Table P-18. A few principals noted that the IIC met informally at times in addition to the regular schedule, but not as many as the 3 who reported no

scheduled meetings and the 9 who reported just one-half hour per week. In any event, virtually all schools reported having an organized IIC and the great majority of those also reported regular meetings of at least one-hour per week.

An equally sensitive indicator of serious IIC activity is reported in Table P-19. A total of 92 schools (45%) prepared agendas for each meeting and kept a log or set of minutes. On the other hand, 33% had an agenda but kept no formal record of the deliberations or decisions made, and 4% kept a log but had no formal agenda. Finally, 24 principals (12%) reported having neither agendas nor minutes; and in two states this last finding described more than 25% of the schools responding. (Visit-interviews along with the opportunity to study records resulted in on-site observation of all four of these agenda-log relationships).

One might infer that the IIC in fact was not yet solidly in charge of the instructional program in a number of 1971-72 schools (decisions made in other ways), or that the IIC functions and possible contributions were not fully understood.

As an aside, and one fraught with potential confusion, second-semester schools were asked to answer two additional questions:

a) When was the IIC set up?

b) When did the IIC actually begin functioning as the "governing group" for the school's program?

The responses were multifarious. One school set up the IIC in September 1971 but by April it was still an "advisory group," and two others indicated that it had been set up but was not functioning. In many cases, the IIC was said to be set up and functioning in October or November of 1971, three months before the date listed as the installation date of MUSE/IGE. Still another group indicated September or October setting-up and January or February functioning. This last at least suggests a preparation and planning period for the IIC, but accounts for only four schools. All of this makes it difficult to use either date as a criterion for "actual" initiation of MUSE or IGE implementation, a problem discussed earlier in this chapter.

(B) Units and Unit Organization. A number of items were concerned with this broad area of installation. By interpreting information from various sources in the instrument it was possible to determine the number of units organized in every school. Table P-21 shows the range to be from NONE to 8 or more. The numbers of units most frequently shown were 2, 3, and 4, together

accounting for 74% of the schools. Two schools reported having no units organized as yet. Generally, the number of units follows school size, although the relationship is far from close since unit size itself was so variable. As Table P-22 reports, there were 7 schools whose typical unit size was under 50 children, and 3 schools with a typical unit size of over 200 students. The most frequent range (typical of 57 schools, or 28%) was between 101 and 125 children.

Overall, 99% of schools were reported to have children organized into units. We must also ask whether all these units were multiaged (at least a 2-year age span). Table P-23 outlines the findings by contrasting number of units with number of units multiaged. There were 661 units reported across all states, and 580 of these were determined to be multiaged...for a percentage ratio of 89%. Ratios varied considerably across states, however, ranging from 64% to 100% multiaging. In addition, it was discovered that 6 schools which had units organized reported that none of their units was multiaged. (The implication, and a correct one, is that in certain schools some units were multiaged and some not).

> An important clarification on the matter of multiaging will be made in later sections. While the great majority of units were organized by multiaging the children, it did not necessarily follow that instruction was carried out that way.

Another important initial objective is the complete organization into units. The question was directly asked, "Is your school fully unitized at this time?" Table P-24 shows a great similarity between Yes and No answers: for the total group 56% responded Yes and 44% replied No. The same rough relationship held for the two semester groups, but within states there was more variation. One state had as few as 36% Yes responses while another was at the 79% level.

"Disparities" from full unitization are explained in Table P-25 which reveals that 45 schools (22%) had the kindergarten separate from the primary unit(s); in most cases, that was the only exception. However, more than one reason was often supplied, and across all schools these were:

1. Kindergarten separate.....22% of schools
2. Special Education, EMR, TMR, and emotionally disturbed: separate from the "regular" units.... 8%
3. 1 or 2 grades self-contained..... 6%
4. 3 or 4 grades self-contained..... 6%
5. 1 or 2 rooms self-contained..... 2%
6. Grades 5-8 (or some combination) departmentalized..... 6%
7. Only 1 unit in the school..... 4%
8. Only 2 units in the school..... 2%

The first two categories together account for at least half of the schools not fully unitized, leaving approximately 40 schools covered by other exceptions. Since keeping kindergarten and Special Education groups in separate instructional programs may have been expected in the nationwide installation, at least in the first year, perhaps categories 3 through 6 are of greater interest. In a number of schools whole grades were not unitized, or certain classrooms were and some departmentalization was also reported. Categories 7 and 8 overlap to some extent with earlier classifications, but serve to emphasize the lack of unitization reported. They were tabulated only if there were other "regular" students in the school who were not organized into units; if a school had only one unit because it had only 135 students, it was not included here, for example.

In connection with full unitization, differences between fall and spring semesters were minimal (except for upper level departmentalization). From one point of view, it could be said that the spring installers were proportionately almost as far along as the fall group.

Another item asked about "unusual units, special in some way but which functioned as units." A total of 36 principals (18%) replied. In 18 schools a "special subjects unit" had been organized to manage the teaching of art, music, and physical education, but in these cases "unit" meant a group of teachers, not a group of students. Ten schools indicated that special education children were located in "regular" units (often called "mainstreaming"). In 5 schools special education children were themselves formed into a functioning unit. The other three responses were not clear.

Tables P-26 and P-27 report on typical amounts of weekly planning time for teachers in the organized units. As Table P-26 shows, 47% of unit leaders did not have their own separate planning time (during school hours), but the remainder had anywhere from ½ hour to 5 or more hours per week. (Except in one school whose 1-hour IIC meeting was billed as "leaders' planning time")! There is a disparity between semesters and among states in the NONE category;

the fall group had 43% with no separate time, but spring showed 75% with none. Within the states the NONE percentage ranged from 12% to 85%. The picture is very different, however, for unit planning time (see Table P-27). Only 7 schools (3%) reported no school-day unit planning time, with the remainder having typically anywhere from ½ hour per week to 5 or more hours. Two hours per week was the modal response, and the range from 1 to 3 hours included a total of 70% of the schools. For leader and unit planning time there were numerous within-school differences, sometimes as great as 3 hours per week; for reporting purposes, disparate responses were averaged into one figure representing what was typical for the school.

The numbers of children typical in units have already been reported. Tables P-28, P-29, and P-30 outline the numbers of student teachers, aides, and interns which are typical across all units of the school. Half of the schools reported having student teachers; in most cases there was one per unit but some units had as many as 4 or 5 within the first few months of the school year. There are notable state-by-state differences: in one state 15% of the schools had no student-teachers, while in another state 64% of the schools had none.

Aides are considered important to MUSE/IGE operations. Table P-29 shows that 18% of schools did not typically have aides in the units; this figure includes a few instances where an aide served 3 or 4 units, and was counted as "none" for reporting's sake. Noting that some schools had NO aides, it is of interest that some others had as many as 2 or even 3 typically in each unit. State differences are again noted, since in one state only 6% of schools had no aides at all while in another state fully 61% reported having no aides. The disparity holds for semesters as well, the spring group having proportionately far more schools with no aides assisting the program.

A number of schools also had interns; 27 schools (14%) reported 1 to 5 interns typically in their units, as shown in Table P-30. (One school visited, which did not respond to this questionnaire, had as many as 10 teacher corps interns assigned to each unit at the same time).

Numbers of teachers assigned to units were also examined, and are reported here without reference to a table. The smallest number of teachers in the organized units of a given school ranged from 1 to 9, and the largest number from 2 to 9, with every step in these ranges checked for at least one school. The mode in both cases was 4, though the curve showing largest

number was skewed to the upper end of the scale. There was little variation in the number of teachers per unit within given schools; what was most typical was, in effect, to divide the number of teachers quite evenly into the number of units.

So far as we know, no particular number of teachers per unit is considered desirable or standard. But from the standpoint of most effective use of differentiated staffing potential, we might arbitrarily suggest from 3 to 5 teachers per unit. Using that as a criterion, we see that 25 schools (13%) typically had units with only 1 or 2 teachers. Similarly, 31 schools (16%) had units with as many as 7, 8, or 9 teachers. (Of this last group, 4 schools had units with 9 teachers assigned to work together). Later feedback may suggest an optimum number of teachers per unit, and this might vary according to the age-levels involved.

(C) IGE Subject-areas. It was not possible in a survey instrument to learn much about IGE instruction. Of probably principal concern is the extent of adherence to the instructional programing model, and little can be said about that at this point. But later reference to the second questionnaire and to site-visits will supply some useful information.

On the question of number of IGE subject-areas "now being emphasized," Table P-31 shows that 11 schools (or 5%) reported NONE. In successive order, 1, 2, 3, and 4 IGE subject areas were reported by 107, 49, 12, and 11 schools. Thus a total of 156 schools (76%) reported having 1 or 2 IGE subjects, and 23 reported having 3 or 4 subjects.

One unusual finding was that 9 schools (4%) reported using the IGE approach in "all subjects." Among these nine were schools in 5 different states and even 1 school which installed in the second semester. Another observation is that 49% of fall installers listed one IGE subject (the great majority of the rest listing more than one), but 66% of the spring group were in that category.

"IGE subject-area instruction" can mean many things. Findings from the second questionnaire and from site-visits strongly suggest that many definitions be anticipated, from full instructional programing according to the model, to the one subject which is taught by all teachers in the unit, to a subject being planned for later adoption. This caution is perhaps useful when it is remembered that 32 schools listed 3 or more IGE subject-areas and a few of these listed all subjects.

As to whether the IGE subject-areas are practiced in all of the school's units, Table P-32 provides this information. A total of 28 schools (or

14%) reported that while they may have IGE subject(s), they are not taught in all units; this is larger by 17 schools than the number which reported having no IGE subject-area at all. Comparison of Tables P-31 and P-32 shows that in the overall picture there is an inverse relationship between the number of IGE subjects and the number being taught in all the school's units. In fact, a number of schools reporting 3 or 4 subject-areas indicated that there was a different IGE subject in each unit. And a few schools acknowledged having the single IGE subject being "tried out" in just one unit.

It was possible to tally the names of subject-areas adopted for IGE-ing for the great majority of schools. The resulting count lists them in the following order of most-to-least popular:

Reading
Mathematics
Language Arts (various aspects)
Wisconsin Design for reading skill
Science
Social Studies

"Reading" is perhaps confusing here, since many principals no doubt used that for the Wisconsin Design (which is at present limited to word-attack instruction).

As a sidenote, in addition to then-present IGE subject-areas, 37 schools in the fall group noted plans to begin another IGE subject during the remainder of the school year, and 3 spring semester schools did the same.

Extent of Training and Exposure to MUSE/IGE Concepts

The questionnaire listed a total of 19 different sorts of conferences, workshops, and activities by which school personnel might (a) become acquainted with MUSE/IGE, (b) make a formal commitment to proceed with MUSE/IGE, (c) get general or specific training, (d) develop avenues of communication and mutual support, or (e) solve emerging problems through the school year. Several of these constituted a "stated package" of standard events which it was hoped all or most schools would engage in one way or another, wherever they might be held. A second group were specific training workshops held at particular times and places. The third set more nearly represented miscellaneous opportunities which might be taken advantage of, and included informal meetings, school visits, and special problem-solving sessions.

Principals were asked to indicate attendance at each of these sorts of training events. Multiple responses were encouraged. That is, where principal, staff teachers, and librarian all attended the same event, we asked that all three be checked. Thus, numbers and percentages in the tables reflect the number of schools represented by each category of attendee, not the total

number of schools represented at a given activity. In many instances, though, the number of principals reported will closely approximate the number of schools represented.

Tables P-33 to P-47 all follow this pattern, reporting attendance by principal, unit leader(s), staff teacher(s), librarian(s), and so on. In one instance the presence of district personnel is noted, and in many cases the term "other school person" is used to denote unnamed categories at the school level.

A limitation should be noted. Even among school principals, apparently it was not always clear just what training sessions had been attended; in some cases marginal notes indicated this, and in others internal evidence suggested such confusion. Lack of specific records or simply not recalling attendance may account for this in part. Perhaps even more, the names of the conferences and workshops were not universally applicable, and our attempt to distinguish the various events was not completely successful. In any case, there was some clearcut confusion about names, dates, and attendees across the total group of respondents. If nothing else, this suggests that the "training chain" of five standard sessions was not a constant which school people recognized or participated in. Where feasible, we rearranged the confused entries but only when the clues were unmistakable--as for example where the staff development workshop and the preschool workshop were reversed, or when 16 staff members from a single school were said to have attended the 1-day national awareness conference.

(A) The Standard Set of Five Conferences (Training Chain). These five events have special importance since they all were to have occurred prior to actual implementation of MUSE/IGE as an operating system of instruction. They represented opportunities for acquaintance, commitment, advanced preparation, and immediate preparation. And while attendance was not obligatory for schools, it was presumed that some sort of participation in all five (by school and district personnel) would be necessary for effective installation. Moreover, a hierarchy of personnel was involved here as well as a sequence of activities: from state commitment to district and school commitment to school leaders' training to school staff training.

Table P-33: Introductory 1-day national overview conference on MUSE/IGE. Though held more for state and district personnel, these early 1971 conferences attracted 34 principals and 13 other school persons, representing six of the ten states. These figures do not include principals who reported attending a more local sort of "national" awareness meeting (for example,

university-sponsored overview conferences or ones held in small towns on what was obviously a region-of-the-state basis).

It may be a little disconcerting to note that only 6 principals reported attendance by their district personnel. Yet, 32 districts reported attendance at these national meetings (see Table D-31). Even allowing that a few district persons responded to the first questionnaire whose school principals did not, the disparity is notable. Apparently a number of principals were not aware (or did not report) that their own district representatives had attended these initial awareness sessions.

Table P-34: State Conference (for superintendents, principals, and state agency personnel) for state and district formal commitment. Over half the principals (58%) reported attending such meetings, which were sometimes held on a regional basis within states. Also, 31 schools were represented by unit leaders, and 25 schools by other persons. Principals attended from all ten states, and the other two groups from seven states. Presumably in a good number of cases where such formal meetings were held, district representatives took care of the business. However, the table shows that in six states, over two-thirds of the principals reported their attendance, with New Jersey at the 100% level.

Table P-35: Pre-installation workshop at the school level, for overview, commitment, and preliminary planning. In all, 94 principals (46%) reported attendance, and it may be conjectured that there were hardly more such meetings than principals who attended them. These local workshops were attended by unit leaders from 80 schools (39%), staff teachers from 52 schools (or 25%), and fewer individuals in four other categories. Assuming 46% of schools with such a workshop as the top figure, what then of the remaining 109 schools? There is little doubt that most schools had some such means of fulfilling these overview, commitment, and planning purposes. But perhaps the questionnaire implied a very formal session, while in fact many schools may have had a faculty meeting or other brief and informal conference -- or indeed may have used only written means of communication.

For the roughly 50% of schools which had the "pre-installation workshop," a few principals reported that only they themselves "attended." In most instances unit leaders were involved, but staff teachers were included in only 52 of the 94 schools. This leads to a supposition that many "workshops" were not actually held for the whole staff or at the school, but may have been conferences at the district level where principals and unit leaders reported the school's readiness to proceed.

Table P-36: 3-day staff development workshop for principals and unit leaders (sponsored mostly at the state level). For this particular session, it would hardly seem that there could be confusion over the title (two alternative names were listed in the questionnaire) or the restrictive purpose of the workshop: to train principals and unit leaders so that they could then pass on the training to school staffs. Yet only 151 principals (or 74%) indicated attendance for themselves, while 135 (66%) reported that unit leaders had attended. There was a very small number of instances where the principal did not attend but unit leaders did, and in another few cases the opposite was true. (Several respondents wrote marginal notes to the effect that their schools had "entered the program" too late to participate in the state's principal-unit leader training; and the same may apply to others who omitted this item. This observation reminds us that many schools which installed in September 1971 reported that their commitment took place between July and September 1971 (see Table P-10).

Variation among states was apparent in connection with the staff evelopment training. While every state organized and made available such training, two states had over 90% of principals attending, and four states had attendance in the 50% to 70% range. Attendance by unit leaders followed the same pattern across states.

Finally, the attendance of staff teachers from 25 schools, counselors from 6 schools, librarians from 7, and reading or math teachers from 20 implies that persons other than "school leaders" were made welcome at the training, though many fewer schools were represented by these persons. (New Jersey was the only state with only the school leaders in attendance). Possibly a number of these persons were sent as alternates for principals and unit leaders (we know of two instances through interview data), or (again, interviews back this up) some attended as staff teachers who were later selected for the unit leader role.

Table P-37: Preschool workshop (usually 3 to 5 days) in the local school for final preparation to begin the implementation with children. Only 119 principals (or 58%) reported their attendance at this important session, along with unit leaders of the school. Two others indicated that they had not been present but unit leaders had, and in all, staff teachers from 114 schools (56%) were reported to have participated. Again, it seems unlikely that there could be confusion about the nature of this workshop, or its name, especially since the questionnaire emphasized "workshop for the whole school

staff." From that point of view, these attendance figures are quite low. We do know of cases where it wasn't possible to have such a workshop prior to the opening of school and some alternate strategies were developed.

Several other notes are in order. Apparently no school in New Jersey had such a preschool workshop--which reinforces the observation that even though many schools count themselves as spring-semester installers, still "actual" implementation is planned for the fall of 1972. Second, there are large between-state differences in attendance. Looking particularly at entries for principal, unit leaders, and staff teachers, it is clear that all but two Connecticut schools reported having a Preschool Workshop, while one Indiana school had the Workshop and half in Minnesota did. The other states fall between these high, medium, and low figures.

Third, a notably smaller proportion of spring-semester schools than the fall group reported having or attending the Preschool Workshop--12% as opposed to 68%.

Fourth, there appears to be considerable variation in what is considered the "whole school staff." Fewer than half the schools included personnel other than the principal, unit leaders, and staff teachers. Within these, 46% of the Colorado schools included the special subject teachers (art, physical education), but in Minnesota this was true in 11% of the schools reporting. The same kinds of variations held for other personnel groups.

To put the Preschool Workshop picture in perspective--across all 205 schools and among the 121 which reported attendance at it--the chart below may be of some assistance.

PRESCHOOL WORKSHOP	
Total potential number of schools	205
Number of schools with principal attending	119
" unit leaders attending	121
" staff teachers attending	114
Schools with librarian/IMC director attending	50
" aides attending	49
" special-subject teachers attending	48
" special education teachers attending	39
" reading/math teachers attending	39
" interns, student-teachers attending	27
" counselors attending	5

(B) Specific Stated Workshops at Particular Locations. A series of workshops was sponsored directly or indirectly by the R & D Center, at a variety of locations and over a 7-month period. None of these was obligatory in any sense. Apparently most workshops were part of the original plan, but were not included as steps in the "training chain" discussed in section (A) just

above. There were three distinct target groups: reading teachers and specialists, principals, and unit leaders. Because these workshops were held at single locations and at given times, our guess is that the attendance reported for school people would be accurate.

Table P-38: Workshop on Reading, June 28-30, 1971, in Madison, Wisconsin. Attendance was reported for principals from 10 schools, unit leaders from 12 schools, staff teachers from 7, and reading teachers from 12. The majority in all classifications were from Wisconsin, with three states not represented.

Table P-39: Reading Institute, July 26-30, 1971, in Madison. Also emphasizing the Wisconsin Design for reading skill development, this session attracted principals from 4 schools, reading teachers from 6, and other school personnel from 3 locations. Two states not represented at the June workshop were included in the tally, with the majority of reported attendees again from Wisconsin.

Table P-40: Workshop for experienced reading teachers, August 2-6, 1971, in Madison. We presume that this session was intended for teachers already familiar with the Wisconsin Design. Only 3 principals reported that their school's reading teacher had attended.

Table P-41: Workshop for experienced unit leaders, August 2-6, 1971, in Eau Claire, Wisconsin. Presumably no staff of "new" 1971-72 MUSE/IGE schools would be involved in such a session, but unit leaders from 4 schools attended as did one other school person.

Table P-42: Workshop for experienced MUSE/IGE principals, August 2-6, 1971, in Madison. Another session planned for experienced school personnel, this workshop was attended by principals from 11 schools and one other school person.

Table P-43: Workshop for experienced unit leaders. Four of these were conducted (5 days each) at stated times in October and November 1971--one each in Milwaukee, Eau Claire, and LaCrosse (Wisconsin), and in Toledo. Schools which began installation in fall 1971 were qualified to send unit leaders. Alltold, unit leaders from 40 schools attended along with other persons from 8 schools. Included were unit leaders from 6 schools which were at that time preparing for spring-semester installation.

Unit leaders attended from 6 states, again with the largest number from Wisconsin. What is notable is that 7 of these were from one state, Nebraska, meaning that each of the 7 schools responding had sent at least one unit leader for additional training. In other states the percentages of schools represented were much lower.

Table P-44: Workshop for experienced principals, November 15-19, 1971, in Milwaukee. This workshop drew principals from 23 schools, the great majority again from Wisconsin.

Table P-45: Workshop for experienced principals and experienced unit leaders, January 10-15, 1972, in Madison. We were able to edit this entry into the questionnaire at the last moment, and found that fairly large numbers of persons attended these two workshops which were conducted separately but during the same week. In all, 42 schools (or 20%) sent principals to this workshop, and 32 (or 16%) sent unit leaders. In the majority of cases the principal and one unit leader attended from a given school. As can be seen, eight states were represented among both the principals and unit leaders.

Of all eight types of stated workshops in this list, the January sessions were the first attended by school people from Colorado, the state farthest from the Wisconsin training centers. Study of all eight tables shows that schools in other states as well were represented seldom: New Jersey schools sent representatives to one session, and South Carolinians were able to attend two of these workshops. The word "representatives" is used advisedly, especially with reference to unit leaders; most frequently, one unit leader per school attended the workshop and was expected, in effect, to return home and give guidance to other unit leaders as well as the staff teachers.

Information from other sources makes it clear that attendance at these stated workshops was much larger than what is reported here. The reading sessions, for example, were directed to people from schools using the Wisconsin Design--whether or not involved in MUSE/IGE. And the conferences for "experienced personnel" were attended by many people representing schools which had installed prior to the current year.

(C) Miscellaneous Opportunities for Training and Exposure. Even further removed from the training chain plan are these additional activities which schools, districts, or linkage groups might have arranged in response to special needs. Six classifications were included in the list principals were asked to check.

Table P-46a: Visits to operating MUSE/IGE schools. Over 100 schools reported participating in such visits, which occurred in spring or fall 1971. Principals from 112 schools, unit leaders from 100 schools, staff teachers from 85 schools--these persons attended along with librarians, special subject teachers, reading teachers, and a few counselors and aides.

First and second semester figures are shown to emphasize the predominance of spring-semester principals who made such visits as compared with unit leaders and staff teachers. (Spring-installing schools included no other categories in these visits). There are wide disparities among states as well, but this is best explained by the proximity to schools which had implemented MUSE/IGE in the 1970-71 school year or earlier.

By sheer force of numbers, the opportunity to visit a functioning MUSE/IGE school was taken advantage of to a greater degree than the various specialized workshops discussed in section (B) just above. And such a visit has special appeal: you go where it's happening. One principal reported that many of the staff went on a volunteer basis during vacation "and each person paid his own expenses."

Table P-46b: League-sponsored general training or meetings. Formal linkages of schools in the various states have held a variety of training sessions. Even after just a few months of implementation effort, principals of 126 schools (62%) reported involvement in such activities. Unit leaders from 99 schools were reported to have taken part, as were staff teachers from 55 schools, and a few each in other categories. As with visits to schools, there was a tendency for these linkage activities to be made most available to principals and unit leaders, with lesser opportunity for staff teachers, and considerably less for other groups. While this may simply be saying that it is easier for some groups than others to get away from the school for special events, it is likewise suggesting that linkage groups were concerned primarily with the principal and unit leader roles, at least up to the time the questionnaire was completed.

Table P-47a: Special statewide or regional reading conferences for reading personnel. The findings show that reading teachers from 23 schools in 6 states attended such conferences, along with principals from 17 schools. It is of course possible that respondents were thinking of other conferences than those specifically concerned with reading as an IGE subject-area.

Table P-47b: Specially arranged staff development training for the school staff (perhaps with other local schools). A fairly large number of schools indicated having made these special training efforts at the local level. This included principals of 37 schools (18%), unit leaders from 37 schools, staff teachers from 26, and persons in three other categories. A glance at the entries across states shows that in all but one state the persons most involved were principals, unit leaders, and staff teachers.

While we cannot define these sessions more than was done in the questionnaire, we do know that a number of schools held such training and had the assistance of consultants from the R & D Center, I/D/E/A, and/or the state department of education. For this reason it is possible that the reporting of these training endeavors may duplicate or overlap with what is also reported as inservice training, the state staff development workshop, or even the preschool workshop.

Table P-47c: Special conference, at the district level, for general purposes or problem-solving. Across all states, 36 principals reported involvement in such conferences, and attendance by others was reported for 4 schools.

Table P-47d: Miscellaneous other activities. Principals reported that 20 schools, represented by any member of the staff, engaged in miscellaneous other training or exposure activities. These were not further defined.

(D) There were, overall, three sets of meetings and workshops listed in the school questionnaire: a) the standard set of five national, state, and local meetings which were considered the training chain; b) the several stated training sessions held under the aegis of the R & D Center for specific target groups of school people; and c) a variety of activities neither planned nor necessarily expected by the R & D Center or state implementation agencies --these were activities held at the option of the school, district, or linkage group, and they presumably were arranged in response to perceived needs or requests.

While the R & D Center staff, as well as planners and trainers associated with I/D/E/A, have encouraged the acts of awareness, commitment, training for school leaders, and training for the whole staff prior to implementation of MUSE/IGE in the functioning school, there has been no absolute set of required means of accomplishing these purposes. Rather, the suggested training approaches appear to be facilitating and enhancing activities, and have been billed as desirable ones. From this point of view--which we trust is an accurate statement--it is not surprising that states, districts, and schools have found various ways of accomplishing the informational and training functions. And they have clearly engaged in differing amounts of such activities.

Of particular interest at this point is the extent (and variety) of training for school personnel. The training chain was apparently intended as a sequence of meetings and workshops which would insure adequate acquaintance and training for the teachers ultimately at work in the unit classrooms.

But as the preceding findings make abundantly clear, the training chain of five steps was not perceived as a necessary set of prerequisites by the agents of change: the implementation agency, the district administration, the school staff. This interpretation is dependent, of course, on the data reported by respondents.

Using the data reported directly by the 205 principals--and using attendance by principals as the basis of analysis--we can see that schools as a group participated in the training chain elements to quite different degrees.

Training Activity	Number of Schools
1. National Overview	34
2. State commitment	118
3. Local commitment	94
4. Training for leaders	151
5. Training for "whole staff"	121

In three of these cases the proportion of schools is above 50% of the total, but never higher than 74%. And as noted earlier, the greatest share of the total "exposure" in these schools went to the principals; unit leaders were involved next most frequently, but staff teachers shared to any meaningful extent only in step #5.

It is also clear that schools have engaged in a variety of other activities--many before, but most after the reported date of installation--which have amplified upon elements of the training chain. In fact, because these activities came later in many cases, an advantage no doubt accrued; school people might benefit in different ways from later training, discussion, and exposure after having already begun the implementation process. The additional activities which affected the greatest number of schools were these:

Training Activity	Number of Schools
Special staff development training	37
Various activities with linkage group	126
Visits to operating MUSE/IGE schools	112
Workshops for experienced unit leaders	76
Workshops for experienced principals	76

The first three activities listed just above were widely participated in by staff teachers (in comparison with certain other training events), as well as by principals and unit leaders. The latter two of course gave additional training to the school leaders. (It may be of interest to note, by the way, that the January 1972 workshops for experienced leaders were by far the most popular).

Further, while some school leaders attended virtually all training opportunities, there were other principals and unit leaders who did not or could not attend the original staff development workshop intended for them. Many of these persons were able to substitute for this at a later time by participating in the workshops for "experienced personnel" held in the fall and winter. Thus for them, it was the first extended formal training and a fortunate circumstance that the workshops were held. Study of related tables and perusal of the completed instruments shows that these statements apply to schools in most of the ten states.

Unfortunately, there were also several instances where school leaders attended neither the principal-unit leader workshop nor a later training opportunity. And in one case, visits to 2 MUSE/IGE schools constituted the only training for anyone on the school staff, and even at that no staff teachers went on the visit trips. (This is not based on the principal's having skipped over the questionnaire items; she actually wrote in the word "none" for every training event except school visits).

Thus, by way of summary, it would appear that the R & D Center workshops for specific groups and the activities promoted by local and linkage option were potentially as important in the whole training design as the initial training chain. Obviously, many schools and many school personnel have found reasons to take advantage of these opportunities both before and after the actual initiation of MUSE/IGE practices in the schools.

However, there remains a question that may never be answered--or at best by examining personal reactions later--and that is: Should schools definitely participate in the five elements of the training chain, or can these be omitted without ill effect? Many schools "omitted" the national overview (which is hardly surprising); and many omitted having even the formal training workshop for the school staff--and yet moved into the installation process. Subsequent discussions in this report may shed light on the wisdom of these omissions, since opinions were expressed in the later questionnaire and during site visits.

Resources and Assistance Available and Made Use Of.

The questionnaire polled principals as to the use of print and film materials by themselves and others. They were also asked to describe lines of communication with various resource persons and groups. As was the case with the training chain and the other exposure opportunities, these resources

were presumably available--and in effect the questions being asked through various items were: Are you using these resources? Are you finding them of value and importance?

(A) Print and film materials. First, what about the use of a set of implementation criteria as a guide to installation? Table P-48 shows that 178 principals (87%) replied Yes--with 23 No's and just 4 omits. In percentage terms, only one state is clearly below the rest, and all principals in two states (Ohio and South Carolina) reported use of a guide. Table P-49 reports the numbers using particular guides, and it is apparent that over 100 principals were making use of two guides. Some 72% reported use of the I/D/E/A Implementation Guide, 41% checked the R & D Center Guide (bluebook), and 26% the revised R & D Center guide called "Performance Objectives." All three guides were used in all 10 states to some extent. No attempt was made to define how the guide was used or whether it was in continuous use. (One principal cautiously noted that he had the guide but "uses it sparingly").

Table P-50 reports the use of a variety of explanatory and training materials by different groups in the school. Principals were asked to indicate which groups had had "an opportunity to see, hear, or study these materials at any time." For each item, the table shows number of schools reporting use by principal; principal and unit leaders; principal, unit leaders, and staff teachers; principal, unit leaders, staff teachers, and aides; and finally all the aforementioned plus other school personnel. These are reported in exclusive columns. For example, 4 principals reported that only they had seen the IGE filmstrips; [illegible] reported that they and unit leaders had used them; another 77 (or 38%) reported use by principal, unit leaders, and staff teachers. The largest group (84, or 41%) reported use by principal, unit leaders, staff teachers, and aides. Then 6 schools reported use by all named categories plus others, and 20 schools in all (10%) reported no use of the filmstrips and cassettes.

Some materials were widely used, others sparsely. For example, one film ("One at a Time Together") had been seen by personnel in all but 9 schools, while staffs in 70 schools had not seen the film "Many Roads." The two publications least widely used were technical in nature...the Technical Report #158 on Development and Evaluation and the IGE Simulation Report. For each of these, 62% of the principals reported no use in their schools.

For each item there was a small number of principals who reported that only they themselves had made use of the materials. Considering the nature of the materials--concerned with implementation strategies, goals, and problems--this appears unfortunate. In larger numbers of schools, typically, materials had been used by unit leaders as well. In nearly every instance, the greatest number of schools reported use by principal, unit leaders, and staff teachers. The IGE "Principal's Handbook" was an exception here, although even so, 44 principals reported its use by staff teachers and another 14 reported its use by (or at least availability to) aides as well.

The apparent widespread use of many materials among teachers and aides tempts one to imagine an atmosphere of open communication and everyone's knowing what all the roles are supposed to be. Even if this is accurate, it is offset to a degree by the number of instances where only principals and unit leaders had studied or used materials, so far as reported.

Three items tied for first place in total usage by schools: "One at a Time Together" and two of the IGE booklets, "Unit Operations and Roles" and "Principal's Handbook." Only 9 schools for each of those items reported no use at all.

Tables P-51 and P-52 report something of the availability to school staffs of two IGE booklets and also the four major IGE films. The booklets (Unit Operations and Learning Program) are about equally available to individual teachers or to units (each at about 40% of the schools). In 15 schools (7%) the booklets are available only at the school level. (See Table P-51). As to the four films, Table P-52 shows that these are most typically available at the state level (on loan). This was true for 119, or 58%, of the schools. Next in order, films were available at the district level, and least often at the school level (11 schools, or 6%).

Among the states, what is most notable is that all New Jersey schools had the books available 1 to a teacher, and all Indiana schools had them available 1 to a unit. Other states do not have a clearcut pattern of availability of these two booklets. However, as for the films, their availability at (only) the state level was true of most states.

(B) The State Coordinator. Five tables report the extent of communication between the school and the coordinator. We defined "coordinator" as the coordinator of the state implementation agency (or of the city, in the case of Indianapolis and Lincoln). A few schools quite obviously responded in terms of the local coordinator; and in Ohio it was not always easy to be

sure whether it was the coordinator at the local, college, or state level who was being referred to.

With these difficulties acknowledged, Table P-53 reports on regular as opposed to sporadic contact with the coordinator. Some 167 schools (82%) reported Yes for regular contact, with a range of from 62% to 94% across the several states. Five states ranked at 90% or higher, which may say equally as much about the school principals as about the coordinators. Communication is a two-way matter. The most frequent means of regular contact were a) forms, reports, newsletters, etc., mailed to the principal, and b) principal's attendance at meetings sponsored by the coordinator.

Table P-54 shows that 167 schools (82%) had been visited by the coordinator (though not exactly the same schools as had reported regular contact). In three states, the coordinator had been able to visit at all the schools, and two other states had visit percentages in the 80%-90% range.

Table P-55 lists the purposes for the coordinator's visits. Principals of course could check more than one option, and many did. Among the 167 schools visited, the "general visit" was the most frequent purpose, occurring at 135 schools. And 75 schools reported the purpose as the coordinator's participation in inservice training. Finally, 62 schools were visited in response to a request for assistance or consultation. Every cell in the matrix of ten states and three visit purposes has entries. This indicates that every state coordinator made visits for general coordinating purposes, and also reveals that all of them were asked for assistance and responded by visiting the school. In addition, all apparently participated in inservice training, in anywhere from 18% to 69% of their schools last year.

Did principals directly contact the coordinator to request assistance (of any sort)? Table P-56 shows that 158 (77%) responded Yes. The range is from 67% to 100% across the several states; in four states, 90% or more of the schools made such contacts.

Table P-57 outlines the topics for which coordinator assistance was sought. The most frequent was only obliquely a kind of assistance, in that it amounted to arranging for the use of films and other training materials; 114 principals (56%) indicated this purpose. Across the total group, the kinds of assistance sought were:

Nature of Assistance	Schools	%
Use of films & training materials	114	56
Planning and conducting inservice	95	46
IGE curriculum subject-areas	64	31
How to contact "experienced" schools	61	30
Individualization of instruction	46	22
Functioning of IIC and units	40	20
Working out daily/weekly scheduling	19	9
Personnel decisions	15	7
Other (miscellaneous)	10	5

Requests were fairly evenly distributed among the states, and with the exception of "personnel decisions" virtually every cell in the matrix had entries.

Across the total group, schools have made considerable use of the relationship with the state coordinator as a resource person. Some 82% of schools reported having regular contact with the coordinator. And 82% also reported having been visited by the coordinator for one or another reason, although the "general visit" appeared to be much more frequent than the visit related to problem-solving or participation in inservice training. Moreover, 77% reported having contacted the coordinator for specific sorts of assistance. Based on this last finding alone--and without knowing how the requests were fulfilled or how well—it would certainly appear that the coordinators as a group were very busy and effective people.

On the negative side, principals wrote in some telling comments which emphasize the either difficult or nebulous role the coordinator has. These quotations come from schools in three different states: "This is an affiliation only, not much more." "He is working with new schools, so we get no overlap from the coordinator." "We don't feel our state coordinator would be of much help in these areas."

(C) District and Linkage Groups. Principals were asked whether their district had a central MUSE/IGE governing or policy group. As shown in Table P-58, 98 principals (48%) replied Yes. After it was discovered that principals in the same districts disagreed as to the existence of such a group, a question arose concerning its functioning as a resource to the schools. We pursued this only to the extent of making an inference about the principals' knowledgeability...based upon his reporting a) the group's name and b) its regular meeting schedule. This resulted in the conclusion that of the 98 principals, 8 did not appear to be informed about the district group.

Table P-59 shows 147 principals (72%) reporting that their districts had assigned a MUSE/IGE liaison. This included a number of principals who doubled as the district liaisons. All but 2 spring-installing schools had such a resource, making a considerable fall-spring difference (68% for the fall, 94% for the spring group). Among the 147 schools with a district liaison, several roles were reported for that person. Table P-60 outlines these, and shows that the largest number (for 51% of the schools) had responsibility for coordinating MUSE/IGE plans and implementation in the district. Other roles, in order of frequency, were:

Serving as liaison between the district and the state implementation agency (46%)
Serving as liaison between district administration and the installing school(s) (42%)
Coordinating training for MUSE/IGE and also the use of consultants (34%)
Planning the extension of MUSE/IGE to other schools in the district this year or next (33%)

Most principals reported that the liaison had 2 or 3 of these functions.

Three tables relate to the existence and function of a linkage group of schools, variously called a league, a pact, a network, or a sub-league. In Table P-61 we see that 178 principals (87%) reported membership in a linkage group, with a notably larger proportion in the fall group than in the spring. In five states, all principals reported membership; however, since linkage groups are typically organized within regions of a state, rather than by whole-state, comparisons between states are probably not appropriate. Eleven principals (5%) indicated that there are linkages but their schools are not members, and another 6% reported no linkage groups organized. Both these categories may come as a surprise to state and city coordinators who generally have taken some responsibility for forming the leagues and pacts.

Table P-62 reveals that of the 178 principals reporting linkage membership, 176 replied Yes or No to the question "In general, is your...linkage serving valuable functions as far as your school is concerned?" The great majority answered Yes, but anywhere from 1 to 6 principals--across 9 of the 10 states--answered No (for a total of 25).

Table P-63 reports on the audiences to whom various linkage meetings and conferences were addressed. It is probably safe to assume that most of these amounted to some sort of training or exposure. By far the largest number of activities were billed for principals and unit leaders, with relatively similar proportions for the fall and spring groups. In all, 59 principals reported that linkage conferences had been held for all teachers (in 9 states),

20 for aides (in 7 states), and 26 for total school staffs (in 8 states). The final category was meant to be inclusive of school and district people (and perhaps parents as well), and 41 principals (20%) reported that linkage meetings had been held for "all MUSE/IGE-related personnel." Linkage groups have apparently been quite active in all states and have begun to reach all groups of persons in some way connected with MUSE/IGE.

The Staff Development Workshop for Principals and Unit Leaders.

Aside from accounting for attendance at this basic training session, it was possible to get some additional detail. From the accounting point of view, the most important finding to note is that this time 160 principals indicated attendance (see Table P-64) whereas 151 reported participation in an earlier question (Table P-36). For discussion here, we will use the later and larger figure. With 9 omits and 36 "did not attend," this leaves 160 schools with representatives at the Staff Development Workshop. Those who did not attend the workshop came from seven states.

Table P-64 also shows the variation in length from 1 day to 6 days, with an undetermined period for 79 cases. By far the most frequent length was 3 days, although for the spring group 2 days was almost as popular.

As an overall assessment of the workshop (in terms of meaningfulness and effectiveness), principals checked a 5-point scale ranging from excellent to weak. The group ranking (in order of "votes") was: very good, good, excellent, fair, and weak. Percentage outcomes were virtually the same for fall and spring groups, as reported in Table P-65. In two states (Indiana and California-Nebraska) there were no ratings of Fair or Weak, and in two other states (South Carolina and Ohio) there were no Excellent ratings.

Of greater interest may be the listing of workshop purposes and their reported fulfillment. Many principals responded with one or two items, a few with three. Table P-66 shows the relative frequency of reported purposes and gives a rating breakdown into "Fulfilled, Not Fulfilled, and Partly Fulfilled." The most frequent purpose was to provide orientation and conceptual framework for MUSE/IGE patterns (95 principals listed this category)--and the great majority felt the purpose was fulfilled. In fact, in every one of the seven purposes (and the "other" category) the great majority apparently were satisfied. Of 68 principals who listed "beginning the implementation process" as a purpose, however, 16 indicated no fulfillment or only partial. This category was the one providing the most negative feedback across the total group.

The seven categories which emerged are listed here more specifically than in the table. Apparently these were perceived as the most important workshop purposes, since this was an open-ended question.

1. Orientation to MUSE/IGE: concepts, materials, purposes, instructional programing model, overall changes involved
2. Introduction to implementation and actually beginning the process...concerns, strategies, needs, use of a guide
3. Define roles of principal and unit leader and actually begin the training into the new roles
4. Introduce specific IGE subject areas and curricula suitable for adoption; usually the Wisconsin Design but not always
5. Importance of group processes and interaction, and actual practice in group techniques
6. Preparing for and actually beginning the planning process for individuals, IIC, units, and the whole school
7. Getting to know colleagues, establishing linkage groups, and generating enthusiasm and commitment among them.

Since the workshop was directed to principals and unit leaders, two additional questions were asked. Table P-67 reports whether or not unit leaders had been named at the time of the workshop. Allowing for schools not attending such a workshop, unit leaders had not been named in 29 schools (across 6 of the 10 states). This finding is of interest in itself, but relates also to the subsequent question: did the IIC meet as such, during the workshop, for discussion and planning of MUSE/IGE implementation? Seventy-three principals (representing 36% of the total group) replied NONE as shown in Table P-68. Since these workshops were typically held at the state level, this outcome is puzzling, for in every state some principals replied No and some replied Yes. Two states in particular, Colorado and South Carolina, had very low percentages in this No category (14% and 6% respectively.)

As to IIC's that did not meet, we may conjecture that in some cases the opportunity was there in the schedule but that given schools did not use it, or that a school's full complement of leaders was not present. That last is hardly conjecture. The fact is obvious from the data, and is emphasized by marginal notes provided by the principals. As one said, "Only principals were invited." And another, "We met in the past; but the whole IIC was not at the same meeting." From yet a third state, these observations were made: "My leaders attended, I did not," "Only unit leaders attended," and "Attended only by our elementary director."

For the 81 schools which did report IIC meetings, Table P-68 also defines the number of meeting hours. Hours ranged from 1 (3 schools) to 10 or more (16 schools) with considerable variation within states. We can only speculate that to the extent such sessions were taken seriously, these schools must have been ahead of the game in planning, anticipating, and problem-solving.

The Preschool Workshop for the Whole School Staff

Additional description of this workshop was also possible through data derived from the questionnaire. Accounting for numbers of workshops held, however, presents the same problem as for the Staff Development Workshop discussed just above. In this case, when asked the question directly, "Did your school have a preschool workshop," 142 principals (69%) replied Yes, as detailed in Table P-69. Earlier, the same population of principals indicated that only 121 schools, or 59% had held such a workshop. We will use the larger figure at this time. (The difference, it was determined, lies in the reporting done by principals in 6 of the states.) Both sets of figures, though, emphasize the point that apparently a much smaller proportion of spring installers than fall installers conducted the preschool workshop.

Table P-70 reports when the workshops were held by the 142 schools. The range is from spring 1971 to January 1972, with over two-thirds in August. In most individual states the range was over a 4 or 5-month period, although all workshops in South Carolina were conducted in August.

An attempt was made to learn something about the activities of schools which did not have this important part of the training chain. Table P-71 describes other provisions reported by a total of 57 schools. In place of the formal preschool workshop, many schools had arranged inservice activities during spring, summer, or fall when school was formally in session--and 2 indicated plans to have such a workshop in the summer of 1972. (One principal reported what may be a rare sort of exercise--"We had a pilot week during preparation (March 1971)"). The uneveness of such "make-up" efforts is emphasized by the fact that 3 schools in Colorado reported inservice activity in the spring of 1972, though all were fall 1971 installers. Other examples include these: (a) five other schools reported no training plans, (b) 18 principals wrote something that was in effect undecipherable but referred to "training," (c) 11 schools--mostly in the fall group--reported fall 1971 in-service activities. (As a sidenote, a number of principals indicated that lack of funds was the primary reason for their having no preschool workshop).

Perhaps the most poignant comment was made by a midwestern principal who explained that the district coordinator had visited his school with a filmstrip and a tape.

Table P-72 describes the length of the workshop. Over half of the 142 schools held it for the 3 to 5 days recommended by the R & D Center plan, and another 21 reported longer workshops--up to 10 or more days. A few held 1 or 1½-day sessions.

Table P-73 shows that 129 workshops (of the 142) reported having a program/agenda prepared for the workshop. Six replied No to this item and there were 7 omits.

Since a major goal of the preschool workshop was for the trained principals and unit leaders to pass on the training and preparation to the whole staff, several questions were asked along these lines. First, as reported in Table P-74, in 125 of the 142 schools the principal took an active training/leadership role in the workshop; and in 110 schools, the unit leaders took such roles. Other persons and groups are also reported in the table, but at much lower frequencies. State and local coordinators contributed (not just attended) in a number of schools, as did reading consultants and "outside" consultants. A number of principals noted that consultants or coordinators had pretty much done the whole job. Obviously, if workshops were held, they were planned and conducted. But, as indicated here, in a number of instances principals and unit leaders did not assume direct leadership roles in the preschool workshop. This was true in six of the nine states which had these workshops.

Tables P-75 and P-76 relate to meetings held by the units and the IIC as part of the workshop activity. As reported by principals, all units in a school almost always met for the same length of time. The range is shown in Table P-75. In 8 schools, units did not meet at all. In the remaining 126 schools which responded, units met anywhere from 1 hour to 16 or more, with a bimodal distribution (at 5 to 8 hours, and 16 or more hours). But in as many as 29 schools, the IIC did not meet as part of the workshop. (See Table P-76) For the remaining schools, most IIC's met for 1, 2 or 3 hours, though some were reported to have met 16 or more hours.

Finally, an attempt was made to determine staff attendance at the preschool workshop, as detailed in Table P-77. For each category of attendee, participation is indicated as Total, Partial, or None. For each of the 8 categories, across the total group of schools, there are entries for each

extent of attendance. This takes on meaning when we see that in 2 schools unit leaders attended part of the time, and in 1, none. For principals, the ratios are higher, with 8 reporting partial attendance and 3 indicating their absence from the whole workshop. (It should be noted here that certain categories were omitted more often than others; for example, unit leader attendance is reported for all schools except 1, but principal's attendance for all schools except 7. Aides were omitted by 25 schools, no doubt in locations where no aides had as yet been hired).

Staff teachers, too, were not always in attendance, which raises a question concerning the nature of the workshop. In 12 schools they were partial attendees, and in 2 schools apparently did not attend at all. The picture is increasingly void of full attendance as we look at librarian/IMC directors and teachers of special subjects. In both cases, there were more entered in the None category than in the Partial.

Formal Inservice Training for the Whole School Staff

Regular inservice training--on a schoolwide basis--was emphasized by the R & D Center installation model as a means of maintaining installation impetus; it may perhaps properly be considered a continuing part of the training chain, though it has a "maintenance function" rather than a preparatory one. As with the staff development workshop and the preschool workshop, the questionnaire asked for some detail concerning inservice activities, with distinct emphasis on:

-training for the whole school staff
-training concerned with MUSE/IGE needs
-training occurring after initial installation

As Table P-78 shows, 16 principals omitted the whole general question on inservice, leaving 189 respondents. Of these, 42 (21%) indicated by marginal notes, or in other ways, that they had had no inservice activities for the whole staff. For example, one principal noted that all the topics and activities had been considered, "except we have not set any schedules as yet." Another comment, from a different state, also put the whole matter off: "We have not dealt with any of the above areas. However, plans are now underway to deal with each specifically as we begin our second year." And as one principal noted--who left this section blank--"Too many hours for us to remember what topics or all these details."

The remainder reported varying amounts of schoolwide training. Some 27 (13%) had had 1 to 5 hours of inservice, and the table shows the frequency of inservice training in increments of 5 hours up to 30 or more. The most frequent amount was 6 to 10 hours (reported by 42 schools, or 21% of the total). Twenty schools checked topics and dates but the amount of time involved was not clear. All states but one had schools reporting NONE, and the states in general covered the whole range of inservice hours reported.

As to who usually planned the inservice activities, Table P-79 shows the findings, which put the IIC at the top of the list (92 schools, or 45%). Next in order came the principal alone (15%), the total staff (7%), the school and district together (5%), and smaller percentages of cases where unit leaders, district personnel alone, and consultants planned the inservice program. The IIC as planner was the only entry reported for all states, but in only 2 states was the principal himself not listed as the planning agent.

Of the 13 topics and activities listed in the questionnaire, schools reported how many had been dealt with by the staff, as shown in Table P-80. A number of schools indicated NONE (see also Table P-78), and roughly equal numbers of schools reported 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 topics, and also 8 or more. We are not just sure how to report this with a straight face, but one school apparently covered a good deal of territory. The whole school staff of 24 was present for inservice training, it was reported, when eight topics were studied, all within the same month. One-quarter hour was devoted to each session.

As to topics planned for a future time (late spring or summer), the majority were either omits or NONE's, as reported in Table P-81. However, 31 schools had plans for 1 topic, and 19 schools for 2 topics, with smaller numbers after that. A group of fairly ambitious schools indicated future plans for covering 8 or more topics.

Table P-82 outlines the frequency with which each of the topics was covered by the 150 schools reporting the specifics. In only 4 instances was a given topic not the subject of study in schools within a given state. Using the entries for the total group as an index of need of importance, the topics ranked as follows:

Topic	% of Total Group
Reading	42%
Grouping children	34
Behavioral objectives	34
Reporting procedures (to parents)	28
Unit functions	25
Diagnosis and assessment	24
Development of materials	23
Pupil learning modes	22
Mathematics	19
Train aides, paraprofessionals	18
Evaluation of MUSE/IGE progress	18
IGE record-keeping	17
Subject areas other than reading and mathematics	10

The number of schools reporting across all these topics is rather large; even for the final item listed, 20 schools are involved in that 10%. State coordinators might be helped by this table in seeing the spread of topics their schools worked with and the potential areas of need for these schools or for other schools added in future. There are of course hidden relationships here, since we do not know whether inservice topics were pursued because of not having a preschool workshop, or because of problems unique to a given school, or because of the staffing situation, or whatever.

In any event, topics most frequently dealt with in the total group do not necessarily rank that way within each state's group of schools. Though reading was the inservice subject of greatest mention, 3 other topics were more frequently listed in Colorado, for example, 1 more in Illinois, and 3 more in New Jersey. It may be of interest, too, to note that behavioral objectives was the most frequent topic (and therefore concern?) in four states.

Just about half the schools (48%) reported not having a predetermined schedule of inservice meetings. As shown in Table P-38, another 38% responded in the affirmative.

Principals were also asked about persons or groups--outside the school--who took active roles in planning or conducting inservice sessions. Table P-84 shows that a variety of outsiders had given assistance: state and local coordinators, personnel from other MUSE/IGE schools, consultants from the district or other consultants, and personnel from the R & D Center and I/D/E/A. All categories were represented in all but two of the states, which at least suggests a wide range of personnel resources which schools have called on and can continue to call on. All state coordinators, for example, were listed as having assisted in inservice activities (including Nebraska and California, where the "state" coordinator and local coordinator are the same person).

The final discussion of findings concerning inservice may be of particular interest. The general questionnaire item restricted response to inservice for the whole school staff, but as we studied the returns we became aware that many principals were indicating other approaches. At the same time, the large number of omits was a concern to us, as was the very large number of schools which indicated (see Table P-83) that there was no set schedule of activities. Two additional tallies were attempted in order to make the original findings more meaningful.

1. Many many schools apparently did not have the total school staff present for inservice. We studied the returns and--admittedly based on some guesswork--determined that if we used "total staff present 80% of more of the time" as a criterion, then some 117 schools (57%) could be counted as having inservice for the whole school staff. Similarly, 7% could not be credited, and for another 9% we simply could not tell. About 26% fell into the omit category in this determination. This helped to put the "whole school staff" problem into perspective, but what about the omits and NONE's that consistently showed up in these past few analyses?
2. Various indications, primarily marginal notes here and there on the returns, suggested that some schools simply did not have inservice training for the whole staff, but nevertheless had inservice training. Since no direct question was asked on that point, we are here relying on whatever clues could be picked up. Table P-85 shows that 47 schools provided such clues and lists six different inservice approaches. In 9 schools, inservice was held only within units, while 5 others indicated within units and a little for the staff as a whole. In 4 schools the general faculty meeting was the locus of inservice activity, and 8 others appeared to have a miscellaneous or vague approach, so far as we could interpret. Two schools wrote in that inservice was accomplished at IIC meetings and faculty meetings. (In one case this was carefully spelled out--"I deal with many of the above topics in my daily newsletter and encourage feedback. Discussion comes to IIC and faculty meeting.")

> The largest group, however, has the most intriguing response. Some 19 principals indicated--and in several cases this was done in most emphatic terms--that inservice never starts and never ends, that it is an ongoing day-by-day kind of thing, that all teaching and all meetings and casual conversations in the hallway constitute inservice training. (As one put it, "I include these items in individual and group conferences at various times throughout the day-week-year." In that school by the way, it was reported that the principal is the one who plans inservice training). This is certainly food for thought, although it may very well be that in certain settings or under certain forms of leadership such a pervasive and continuing approach might not work. For those schools anyway, we apparently asked the wrong question...but are grateful for the marginal notes.

Footnotes and marginal comments can put a bit more life into this sort of analysis. And though they hardly represent the whole, they emphasize the concerns and feelings of respondents. Several principals indicated that they simply did not have enough inservice training, or leadership available, or money. Or support. As one wrote, "(We'll have inservice)...when we get support from the central administration." Another put it more directly: "Our school did every damned thing on our own. We don't have commitment from the central office, so therefore we do the best we can under these limited circumstances." As to general concern over inservice, another noted, "This has been a weak area. The topics at present are dealt with only in the units using materials available." And full circle back to the issue of inservice for the entire staff, another principal (in still another state) had this to say:

> I feel this is the greatest weakness in the entire program. Inservice is needed for the <u>total staff</u>. Each individual school is hard pressed for providing expertise. We need much help here!

<u>Other Areas of Interest or Concern</u>.

The four sections which follow do not relate to the accounting task (for attendance at training) or to the basic implementation steps presumed to be of greatest importance. These topics have a significance of their

own, however, and divide into two categories: inputs which might contribute to effective implementation, and outcomes or effects. Neither is exhaustive by any means, but each may provide some useful findings.

(A) The Library, Media Center, or Instructional Materials Center. The library/materials center has not been promoted as a vital ingredient in implementation, though its ultimate importance is of course recognized. Schools varied in the availability of such a center for the instructional program and in its availability to children.

Table P-86 lists a variety of names used for the "center," and these names suggest also a number of different functions. For the spring group, the Library is the most common facility (44%) with the comparatively limited materials and flexibility that that term implies. Only 12% of the fall group used the nomination Library, more frequently indicating Media Center, IMC, and other names which imply the housing of all (or most) instructional materials. What is distressing--for any school and maybe moreso for a MUSE/IGE school--is the fact that across 6 states, 15 schools (7%) report having no such facility at all. If nothing else, this raises a question about the future of instructional programing in those schools. Though it is true that in some locations the instructional media center is divided into as many "parts" as there are units, and this seems to work out. Table P-86 reports 5 schools with such an arrangement.

One principal was constrained to note that the school's library is shared with the high school, and such setups were observed. It makes for a difficult situation--not only in terms of age-ranges but also in terms of philosophical approach and flexibility in utilizing the materials.

On that subject, Table P-87 outlines answers to the question, "How do students use the center?" Roughly equal numbers of schools checked each of the three categories: scheduled use, use with permits, and free access. The Table shows that scheduled use is more often the case in the spring group of schools, and this relates to the nature of the facility (the Library). Most principals marked more than one type of use, but about equal numbers (between 15 and 20) marked scheduled use only and free use only.

Related to nature of the facility and its utilization is fulltime staffing. We determined that of the 205 schools, 142 had fulltime regular staff. Across these schools, people were assigned in the categories shown on the following page:

Fulltime Staff In Library/Materials Center	Number of Schools
1. Librarian (only)	31
2. IMC Director (only)	8
3. Aide (only)	55
4. Librarian and aide	27
5. IMC Director and aide	21

Many of these schools also had parttime staff. On the other hand, all the remaining schools with centers had either parttime staff only or volunteers only.

Notions of the adequate or ideal IMC may differ. Using our own rough standards (based on the staff, student access, and the nature of the materials, books, and supplies), we made an inference concerning how many schools had something approaching the "true IMC"--an instructional materials center. Result: 99 schools (48%) passed the test. Of these 89 were in the fall group (constituting 51% of that sample). A smaller proportion in the spring group appeared to have a going IMC--10 schools, or 31%.

(B) Informing and Reminding Parents of the New Patterns. Table P-88 reports the number of informational activities undertaken to keep parents posted. The most frequent range was 3 or 4 activities, with 75% of the schools covered by the ranges 1-2, 3-4, and 5-6 activities. Two schools reported NONE, and 2 schools reported between 16 and 20. The upper end of the scale is impressive, but the lower end implies a low communications profile. Fully 18% of schools reported 1 or 2 activities, and many of these were just 1.

It appeared useful to explore the dates of activities, in order to infer their nature: either they prepared parents in advance, or they apprised parents after the fact. (See Table P-89). In all, 132 schools (64%) reported at least one informational meeting or publication which antedated the installation (with equal ratios in the fall and spring groups). In 32 schools, this was clearly not the case. For another 15, the dates were not clear; and for the final 20 schools, all reported informational activities were completed prior to the fall or spring installation date. So we have roughly the same number of schools which prepared parents (only) and which informed them after the fact (only).

As to the types of activities used in promotion, Table P-90 lists these and shows the order from most frequent to least frequent. A wide range of approaches was employed, but publications had the edge on meetings. Principals were asked to include district and board announcements, although these

were not strictly functions of the school. One happy footnote was the comment that at the formal parent meeting to promote MUSE/IGE, some parents asked, "Why have you waited so long?"

(C) Group Reactions. Principals were asked to make a rough estimate of the reactions of several groups toward the new MUSE/IGE patterns. A three-point scale (favorable, neutral, unfavorable) was used in this single assessment of group attitude. Across all schools, the overwhelming majority within four groups was reported to have a favorable reaction, as shown in the chart below. For only one group was there some question about favorable inclination toward the MUSE/IGE innovations; this was the school's group of special subject teachers (usually art, physical education, and music). Still, the majority of these groups apparently had a generally favorable attitude, but a sizable number apparently felt neutral and in 11 schools (5%) their reaction was unfavorable.

GROUP RATINGS BY PRINCIPALS

GROUP	Favorable N	%	Neutral N	%	Unfavorable N	%
Classroom Teachers	197	96	8	4		
Parents	177	86	26	13		
Students	190	93	12	6		
Special Teachers	126	62	61	30	11	5
District personnel	173	84	21	10	1	1

One can only say that the general reception given to MUSE/IGE was a favorable one among all groups rated. The relative extent of disaffection among special-subject teachers is something coordinators or others may wish to examine or pursue.

(D) Impacts. Finally, principals were asked about impacts "so far this school year" which they saw as related to the introduction of MUSE/IGE. These might be impacts on people, practices, decisions, or whatever. This seemed to pose a temptation for some to list circumstances which in the balance were facts more than impacts. "Parents are involved," "There has been a change in pupil grading," "A photo in the newspaper," "We need more inservice training"...are samples of statements which we did not include as impacts. Judgements were made about the intensity and definition of the content, and only those statements which appeared to express "real impact" were included in the tabulations made for analysis.

While not many impacts might be expected within the first few months after installation, it seemed important to explore this domain for its possible contribution to staffs of new schools considering MUSE/IGE. Moreover, this was an opportunity to derive a sense of direction and emphasis in the changes that might occur after implementation, across the whole group of schools.

Table P-91 lists the 11 topics contained in the instrument and shows the frequency with which these topics appear to have been translated into impacts. Impacts were most frequent in the areas of decision-making in the school and pupil grading/reporting--each noted by 55 schools (27%). The two topics least often mentioned were press coverage and reaction (7% of the schools) and student attendance (6%). Five areas (including grading/reporting and decision-making) were indicated by spring semester schools, for a total of 16 impacts. This may reflect fall planning and actual initiation of certain practices in those schools, but nonetheless is a notable development after so few months into the program.

The count, however, does not seem as important as the impact, and if indeed a principal feels and can demonstrate that student attendance has markedly improved because of the new patterns, then that is important news even if rare.

Table P-93 describes impacts in terms of number reported per school. Many schools--though principals may have written in certain descriptions--fall into the category of NONE. Beyond that, the range is from 1 impact to 8 or 9, with 3 schools in that last category. Alltold, 126 schools had at least 1 impact listed, and of these, 35 schools reported as many as 4 impacts.

CHAPTER IV

THE DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaires received from representatives of all responding districts are discussed in this chapter. There are two main sections, first the Introduction and then the Findings.

The Introduction describes the procedure, but is concerned primarily with accounting for the numbers of questionnaires sent, received, and used in analysis.

The section on Findings analyzes responses to each questionnaire item and refers to the tables located in Appendix D. In some cases discussion is called for beyond mere explication, and in some other instances interpretation is also provided. All responses are treated as one group, not divided into fall and spring installers, for two reasons: the numbers are small, and some districts had schools installing in both semesters.

The Findings are treated under the headings outlined below; each heading is followed by the Questionnaire item numbers included in that category.

District Groups and MUSE/IGE Relationships	(2,3,10)
Background Factors	(4,5,7,8)
Local Awareness and Publicity Activities	(6,14)
Training and Exposure Activities Undertaken by District Personnel	(11,17,18,19)
Activities and Policies Supportive of MUSE/IGE Implementation	(13,15,16,20)
Impacts and Other Comments	(12,21)

THE DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

The installation criteria of the Wisconson R & D Center call for participation by district personnel: in commitment, in planning, in decision-making, in training, and in supportive assistance to the new MUSE/IGE schools. Because it was expected that districts would participate broadly in the total installation activity--but in many cases separately from the schools themselves--school districts were also polled and many items in the February questionnaire were similar for the school and district populations. The groundwork for developing the more detailed instrument for school principals thus served also in framing items for district personnel. There were likewise opportunities to discuss possible content with state coordinators and a few district personnel during the fall. Several state coordinators in particular were helpful in reviewing pretest forms and suggesting needed deletions and revisions.

The primary interest lay in accounting for district involvement in training activities and in inferring the apparent extent of commitment at the local level. The R & D Center's literature assumes the importance of a committed and knowledgeable district administration, all the more so since important decisions at the district level can greatly facilitate MUSE/IGE implementation and acceptance. Thus, the instrument also asked about the district's relationships within the larger MUSE/IGE structure, its policies on several matters, its "reasons" for moving into the new patterns, and its efforts to assist individual school staffs.

The instrument, however, is a "general" one neither suited to making fine distinctions nor sensitive to the attitudes of district personnel. The main question which was asked--indirectly and in several ways--was this: in what ways and to what extents has the district participated in the overall installation process above and beyond the formal signed agreement with the state department of education? In addition, information was sought on other matters of interest or importance:

1. What schools are listed as 1971-72 installers in the district?
2. How did the district learn about the new MUSE/IGE patterns?
3. Has the district adopted other innovations in recent years?
4. Have there been notable impacts in the first few months?
5. What factors were considered in adopting MUSE/IGE?

Questionnaires were mailed at the same time as the instruments addressed to principals: February 1, for fall 1971 installers; April 1, for spring installers; and May 1, for districts in New Jersey. Bases for the mailing lists were the R & D Center's directory and rosters supplied by state (and city) coordinators. These sources often listed other persons than the superintendent as the "district contact"; coordinators supplied updated lists as late as January so that instruments would be sent to the most appropriate persons. For every school included in the master mailing lists, the questionnaire was mailed to a district representative.

After one month, a follow-up copy of the instrument was forwarded to non-respondents who had been listed as liaisons, contacts, or local coordinators.

A total of 126 responses was received. These are described in Table D-1, found in Appendix D. Of these 126 districts, two indicated that their schools had installed the MUSE/IGE patterns prior to 1971-72, and 12 explained that the district's schools would not install until fall 1972. Thus the 126 returns must be reduced by 14, leaving a total of 112 districts whose complete questionnaire responses will be analyzed and interpreted in this report. Only findings concerned with number of districts, respondents, and agreement of sources will deal with the full 126 responses.

Even so, this represents a better return than may at first appear, since in many cases, a given district had more than one school installing MUSE/IGE. Districts responding for the fall installation accounted for 157 schools; those for the spring, another 39. However, a number of these 196 schools did not themselves respond (via the principal), and thus the district findings do not relate directly to the population of schools which returned questionnaires. Similarly, there were schools which responded whose district representatives did not complete their instruments.

Analysis and interpretation do not reflect these differences, however. What seemed most important was to give as thorough a picture as possible of installation activities and circumstances across the several states. To analyze only for schools and districts where both questionnaires were completed would mean the "loss" of some 40 schools and 8 districts. The chart on the following page summarizes complete district responses, by state, and indicates the number of schools accounted for by those responses.

State Number	Number of Districts Responding	1971-72 Schools Covered
1	13	19
2	7	15
3	18	33
4	14	18
5	6	9
6	9	14
7	32	49
8	1	19
9	9	9
10	3	11
TOTALS	112	196

So far as accounting is concerned, a problem arises at this point and perhaps not surprisingly so. A number of the schools listed by district respondents represent error somewhere along the way, since there is not full agreement among the four sources of information about 1971-72 schools: a) the district respondent, b) the school principal, c) R & D Center directory, and d) the state coordinator rosters. As indicated earlier, some schools were included in one or another list whose principal replied that his school was not involved (or at least would not be until the fall of 1972). Others indicated installation earlier than the current school year. Still other schools were apparently omitted from rosters but included in the district's own response; it was not possible to trace those schools because of schedule difficulties.

Simply to give an idea of the frustration involved in trying to develop correct rosters on a national level, information gleaned from cross-checking is provided in Tables D-2 and D-3. Data are reported in terms of number of districts responding, and reflect responses from all 126 districts.

Agreement between district and school as to installation dates and/or school listings

	Number	%
Agrees with school response	99	79
Doesn't agree with school response	6	5
Can't tell agreement	21	16

Table D-2

Agreement between district and (a) R & D Center directory and (b) state coordinator rosters as to installation dates and/or school listings		
	Number	%
Agrees with both sources	93	74
Agrees with only one source	10	8
Agrees with neither source	23	18

Table D-3

As noted earlier, and in spite of these discrepancies, it was decided to treat all complete returns in order to provide the best overview of practices and conditions in the nationwide installation of MUSE/IGE this year. Before discussion of the findings, the population of respondents should be described. This is done in Table D-4. While six different categories of district personnel were the respondents--with about half being other than superintendents--what is noteworthy is that fully one-fifth of the respondents were school principals, with a unit leader added for good measure. Principals were often listed as district liaison or contacts (and in most cases they also completed the individual school questionnaire). It is likely that they could not help but respond to the district instrument from the school's point of view, and may not have been fully informed about district involvement or policy. Indeed, a number of responses--whether made by principals or others--appeared in terms of school activity. Where these were clearly discernible, they were omitted from the questionnaire data which were tabulated.

Respondents to District Questionnaire		
Category	Number	%
Superintendent	22	17
Asst. or Assoc. Superintendent	22	17
Director of Elementary Education	25	20
Curriculum Director	13	10
Director of Staff Development	3	2
Other district personnel	11	9
Principal	26	21
Unit Leader	1	1
Not specified	3	2
TOTALS	126	100

Table D-4

Findings

The findings are presented most explicitly in Appendix D, containing Tables D-1 to D-45. Explanatory notes are provided here, with reference to those tables. In most cases both actual numbers and percentages are entered; percentages are always rounded. Where tables report responses for a sample of the total (based on numbers replying to a previous item), those responses are also reported as a percentage of the sample.

Number of "omits" is entered in several tables also, although this is not done in instances where the respondent was invited to check several choices or where a previous item limited the number of respondents to subsequent items.

The reader is reminded that responses to questionnaire items were made about half a year into the implementation schedule. Approximately 85% of the questionnaires were completed in the 6th month after installation began; another 5% after about 3 months of installation activity; and the remainder at a time that represented anywhere from 1 to 3 months into reported actual implementation.

District Groups and MUSE/IGE Relationships

(A) Table D-5 shows that three-fourths of the 112 districts had assigned a local person as liaison or coordinator to facilitate MUSE/IGE implementation. (A few other districts indicated plans to assign such a person, but even more--13%--replied that there were no such plans). Among the 86 districts with an assigned liaison, the most popular responsibility was the coordination of multiunit plans and implementation. Other roles--all indicated by a majority of the 86 districts and outlined in Table D-6--included:

- liaison between schools and district administration
- liaison between district and state implementation agency
- coordinates training and use of consultants
- plans for extension of MUSE/IGE in the district

(B) A "system-wide policy committee" or district governing group of some other name is advocated by the R & D Center model. Only 38 districts (or 34%) had such a group this year. As detailed in Table D-7, another 22% had plans to develop a policy group while 32% did not have such plans. The large number of districts without this governing group should not be too surprising, however, since so many districts had only one school implementing

in 1971-72. As schools are added, the system-wide policy committee may take on more importance within these districts.

Of some interest are the 11 responses which clearly showed that the school's IIC (Instructional Improvement Committee) was considered to be serving the district committee function. It may be also conjectured that principals completing the instrument were aware only of their own committee and perhaps did not distinguish the school and district domains. In any case, there appears to be a little confusion over committee names and functions in the MUSE/IGE package.

Tables D-8 to D-10 describe the composition and meeting schedules of the 38 district policy committees. They vary in size from 3 to 11 or more members (with the latter being the most frequent), and meet anywhere from weekly to twice a year. About three-fourths of the districts reported monthly or more frequent meetings, and this at least suggests that their sessions are directed to the ongoing solution of installation problems or the making of necessary policy. The majority of these groups include the superintendent (or assistant or associate). All but one committee have school principals, and the majority also include unit leaders; one third of these 38 districts have followed the suggestion of assigning principals, unit leaders, and staff teachers along with district personnel.

(C) A sizable number of district respondents indicated that a League of schools (or other such linkage) exists in their states or areas and that their schools are members. Table D-11 reports 78% in this response category. The large OMIT population (21, or 19%) may not mean "no response" in the usual sense; respondents were invited to skip over certain items if there had been MUSE/IGE schools in the district in prior years (since our concern was with 1971-72 events and conditions). Some respondents did omit these items, and many others answered some but not all. District personnel were also asked whether the linkage served useful purposes; the great majority who reported League membership also reported the League's general value (see Table D-12).

Background Factors

(A) MUSE/IGE schools are not new to all of these districts. Some 29 in all (or a total of 27%) reported that they had installed the new patterns in schools during the previous year. Table D-13 shows that these ranged

from 1 to 5 schools in given districts. These installations occurred in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, and Colorado--under the aegis of either the Wisconsin R & D Center or I/D/E/A in Dayton.

(B) For the districts which first installed schools in 1971-72, their initial acquaintance with MUSE/IGE came from a wide array of sources. Table D-14 lists these and shows that two-fifths of the districts first learned of the new patterns at "overview" and introductory meetings; the next most popular source was professional journals and other regular publications. To the extent that such data can be considered reliable indicators of actual practice, they suggest that efforts at expansion of MUSE/IGE should not be restricted to one or two modes of promotion.

(C) Table D-15 records the responses to this open-ended question: "What major considerations made it feasible and/or desirable to install the multiunit/IGE patterns in district school(s) this year?" Most respondents replied with only one consideration, but all were tabulated so that the full range could be studied. Responses fell neatly into 6 categories, leaving only 8% listed as miscellaneous or "other." The most frequent response is not unexpected and this paraphrasing adequately sums up the sentiment of the 42 districts which expressed concern for individualization: "to provide direction and framework for the individualized education we wish to accomplish." The other five considerations are outlined below, in descending order of mention:

- staff readiness (& willingness) for these patterns
- we have already been engaged in related patterns; now we are provided a systematic way of continuing
- the school board wishes to move this way, and has lent some encouragement
- we have a building which is suited to these patterns
- financial support (state) for moving this way is available

The first three considerations account for the great majority of responses given and are directly related to MUSE/IGE concerns with individualization. Interest and pressure from the school board may be allied with interest and concern within the administrative and school staffs. But the final two considerations have an interest all their own: apparently in some cases modular buildings were constructed without concrete plans for the

educational program that would fit there; and in a few districts, the availability of financial support seems to be an important motivator.

(D) Of particular significance is the information provided in Tables D-16 and D-17. Respondents were asked to check all innovations which had currency in their districts at any time in the 3 years preceding the 1971-72 school year. The choices listed had been selected because of their immediate relevance to MUSE and IGE, although the point of the question was to get some feeling for the district's responsiveness to educational innovations over a span of years. Considering the 22 OMITS involved (mostly accounted for by the districts which had been invited to skip this item), 90 districts remained as potential innovators. Of these, 79 reported at least one such activity, with many of them having tried or adopted 3, 4, or 5 innovative practices.

It certainly is not easy (or perhaps desirable) to guess at the past practices in a school or district which would be most predictive of successful MUSE/IGE implementation. For what it is worth (see Table D-17), the most frequent innovative practices were team-teaching and the employment of paraprofessionals, with a central materials facility, open building, continuous progress, and ungraded school at about the same frequencies.

Local Awareness and Publicity Activities

(A) Districts were asked to indicate what groups were advised of MUSE/IGE possibilities--after initial awareness but before district commitment. Six options and an "other" category were provided. Table D-18 shows that the school Board and district administration were most frequently informed (74 and 64 districts, respectively); this has more meaning when it is recalled that this item was addressed only to districts for whom 1971-72 was the first installation year. Fully one-third of these districts informed only selected principals --presumably having in mind to encourage the more receptive of them. About the same proportion also advised parent groups and teacher organizations.

(B) Tables D-19 and D-20 outline another set of informational efforts directed toward parents and the community after district commitment. As Table D-19 reveals, 2 districts omitted this item and 17 indicated that there had been no such activity. Thus 93 districts (or 83%) reported at least one meeting or publication for the purpose of informing the school community. Dates entered make it clear that many such events occurred prior to the beginning of the school year (presumably as preparation), while many

others came later (progress reports, question-answer sessions, plans). Table D-19 reports total number of activities, by district, while Table D-20 reports separate frequencies for meetings and publications. Meetings are defined as "parent meetings, coffees, Board meetings"; publications include "newspaper articles, letters from the district office, Board notices, and MUSE/IGE publications distributed."

Training and Exposure Activities Undertaken by District Personnel

(A) As to explanatory and training materials seen or studied by the respondent himself, it should be remembered that 22% of the responding population were principals (and 1 unit leader). Their exposure would be expected to be greater than that of typical district representatives. On the other hand, the item concerned with these multiple materials was the final one which respondents were invited to skip if they had already installed schools prior to 1971-72. Thus we are again dealing with about 90 returns. Table D-21 provides an overview of the total number of materials used (out of 12 listed), divided between the 20 principals and 73 district personnel who responded. Six of the latter reported using 1 to 3 materials, while no principals are listed as having studied so few. For the remainder, however, the ratios balance out--with proportionately more principals using 7 to 10 materials and more district personnel making use of 11 to 12.

Table D-22 reports on the use of the IGE filmstrips (counted as one unit) and the four IGE films--Many Roads, One at a Time Together, Tuesday, and The Unit Meeting. Just over half indicated use of all 5 film materials; two persons had seen none.

In Table D-23 we see that district personnel as a group have apparently become acquainted with the three IGE booklets--Unit Operations and Roles, Principal's Handbook, and The Learning Program. Four reported having used none of the 3 booklets, but 80% reported familiarity with all three.

Four publications are grouped in Table D-24, which shows that each had been seen by 45% or more of those who responded. The learning program simulation and the technical report on evaluation were read with about the same frequency; the two implementation guides (one by the R & D Center, the other by I/D/E/A) were known with greater frequency--the latter to 80% of the responding group.

(B) A number of questions concerned with attendance at training sessions were addressed to all respondents. These opportunities began with spring 1971 national overview/awareness conferences, through local school training sessions, to visits to functioning MUSE/IGE schools, and on to miscellaneous training and exposure activity. As the tables show, in detailing each of these 15 listed activities, relatively small numbers of district personnel participated--except in 1 or 2 notable instances. There was no requirement that they participate, but the installation thesis holds that district personnel should be involved and knowledgeable of all the installation ramifications; presumably the greater the extent of district participation, the greater the opportunity for communication, for an adequate supply of materials, for commitment to the success of the venture in individual schools, and for the solution of problems as they inevitably arise.

In order to simplify reporting, the most likely and most frequent district personnel are named for each activity. Where others attended, they are grouped under "other district"--which means other personnel from the district administration, not from individual schools. At this point it may go without saying, but certain internal evidence in the returns (along with notes added by respondents) suggests that they were not always clear as to the nature of particular sessions attended (by title or by date), and our attempt to distinguish the various activities was not completely successful. Moreover, at times entries were made for one type of conference when another was clearly intended. When feasible, we rearranged the entries but only where the signals were unmistakable.

Multiple responses were encouraged. That is, where a district's superintendent, Board member, and director of elementary education all attended a given conference, we asked that all three be entered. Thus, the numbers and percentages in the tables reflect the number of districts represented by each category of attendee, but not the total number of districts represented at a given activity. The latter will be summarized separately.

Table D-25: Introductory 1-day national overview conference on MUSE/IGE. Few district personnel reported participation at these meetings (which were held in the first half of 1971 at several sites). There were 21 superintendents or associates, 17 supervisors or directors of instruction, 6 reading specialists, and 4 others, in all. A total of 48 persons attended such meetings--representing fewer than 35 districts of the 112.

Table D-26: State conference (for superintendents, principals, and state agency personnel) for state and district formal commitment. This kind of conference was attended by more persons (100) than the national overview conference, and represented 75 districts of the 112.

Table D-27: Pre-installation workshop at the school level, for overview, commitment, and preliminary planning. Three categories of persons attended this sort of meeting in their own districts: superintendent (or associate), supervisor (or director of instruction), and other members of the administrative staff.

Table D-28: 3-day staff development workshop for principals and unit leaders (sponsored mostly at the state level). A surprising number of district persons reported attendance at the staff development workshop intended for school personnel: 22 superintendents, 21 supervisors, 10 reading specialists, and 4 others. Several attended as substitutes, and some because of having had little other chance for an overview of MUSE/IGE needs and plans.

Table D-29: Preschool workshop (usually 3 to 5 days) in the local school for final preparation to begin the implementation with children. Where it may have been expected that more district personnel would be directly involved (as either participants or observers), these workshops were attended by 26 superintendents, 29 supervisors, 15 reading specialists, and 7 others. To be sure, a number of principals reported having had no such formal preschool workshop, so the district representation may be regarded as a little greater than it appears. (We attended preschool workshops in five schools--each in a different state--and observed district personnel involved substantively in the proceedings at each one).

Table D-30 summarizes attendance at the five types of training sessions (reported above) in terms of certain combinations. These five have special importance since they all were to have occurred prior to actual implementation of MUSE/IGE: they represent opportunities for acquaintance, commitment, advanced preparation, and immediate preparation. From the district's point of view, they can also be seen in this wise: The first two (national overview and state commitment) represented trips away from home for district personnel and might both be concerned with overview and commitment. The third (local overview and commitment) was a meeting at the local school level for the purpose of making commitments and plans there, and district attendance would appear to be important. The last two involved actual training

for school personnel--one for the school's leaders and one for the entire staff. We do not suggest that the district personnel should have been present at any or all of these five activities. But Table D-30 may shed some light on the nature and extent of district involvement, viewed across all responses.

This code will help in using the table:

A - introductory national overview conference
B - state conference for district & state commitment
C - overview and commitment conference at the school level
D - staff development workshop for school leaders
E - preschool workshop for entire school staff

District Participation in Various Combinations of the Five Standard Training Activities		
Attendance at...	Number of Districts	Percentage
None of the 5 activities*	17	15
All of the 5 activities	6	5
A and/or B only	24	21
C only	2	2
D + E only	3	3
A and/or B + C	8	7
A and/or B + D and/or E	20	18
A and/or B + C + D and/or E	26	23
Other attendance combination	6	6

Table D-30

*None is defined as (a) complete omission of this section of questionnaire or (b) respondent's note that none had been attended. Most of the "none's", however, were districts beyond their first year of installation--where attendance at the first four sorts of meetings would be essentially unnecessary.

The all and none categories in Table D-30 speak for themselves. The number of districts with representatives at either A or B is 85 (or 76% of the 112 districts). Thus a large majority report, in effect, having made the effort to go to distant meetings in order to learn about MUSE/IGE or to assist in the commitment process.

Similarly, attendance at all three types of meetings (A or B, C, and D or E) was reported by 32 districts--the 6 which attended all five activities plus 26 others with attendance at the three types (see row 8 in Table D-30).

Again, looking at participation in either of the two staff training workshops (D or E), a total of 49 (or 44%) districts were represented.

By any measure, district attendance and participation was at a low level compared with the opportunities available. Clearly, district personnel participated more in the away-from-home activities, which begs a question concerning the local commitment meeting (C) and the local preschool workshop (E). In order to put all of this in more perspective, it may help to see total attendance, by district, for each of the five meetings separately. Table D-31 provides this information.

Number of Districts Attending Each of the Five Activities

Meetings	Number	Percentage
None	17	15
All	6	5
A. National overview	32	29
B. State commitment	75	67
C. Local commitment	44	39
D. School Leader Training	43	38
E. Local staff training	44	39

Table D-31

Two of these meetings would seem to have special importance. Session B--the state commitment meeting--would appear to necessarily involve district personnel, since the district was asked to agree formally to its commitment. As noted above, 67% of districts reported such attendance; it may be that others arranged commitment by mail or phone after the initial overview. As to session E--the local staff training workshops--this would appear to be something the district might require the school to have, even if not attended by district personnel. We know that a number of schools did not report having had such training in a formal sense; and that for those which did, many of their districts were not involved or represented.

If indeed the five sorts of meetings have particular significance in the training chain, and if some importance is attached to their being attended by district personnel--then the breakdown below may be of some futher utility. Here we explore district attendance by individual states at each of the sessions listed. As in the previous discussion, this is reported in terms of districts represented, regardless of how many persons or of what positions.

		Number of Districts Represented						
STATE	*	A National Overview	B State Commitment	C Local Commitment	D Leaders' Training	E Local Staff Training	All	None
1	13	3	7	4	3	4	1	6
2	7	3	7	4	6	7	2	-
3	18	6	17	7	10	6	2	1
4	14	2	8	3	2	3	-	2
5	6	4	3	2	3	2	1	1
6	9	2	7	4	4	4	-	1
7	32	8	18	13	12	18	-	4
8	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
9	9	2	8	6	2	-	-	1
10	3	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
TOTAL	112	32	75	44	43	44	6	17

*Indicates each state's number of completed questionnaires

(C) A second set of training and exposure activities was also listed, comprising four specific workshops and institutes sponsored by the R & D Center and held in Madison, Wisconsin. Except for reading specialists, it was expected that few district personnel would participate; however, we learned that others had attended; we did not want to overlook these four sessions.

Table D-32: June 1971 leadership conference (National Seminar) for state department personnel. This was attended by two superintendents and 3 other district persons. The coordinator network workshop held in October 1971 was attended by two district representatives. We infer that district personnel were welcome to attend these meetings but that they were set primarily for other groups.

Table D-33: The June reading workshop and also the July reading institute are reported in this table. The first was attended by 14 district specialists and 4 other district personnel; the second by 6 reading specialists. (Both of these sessions were attended by a fairly large number of educators, but many of them were reading teachers at the school, rather than the district, level.)

(D) The final set of training opportunities included six sorts of activities which schools, districts, or Leagues might have arranged. None was a specified event and none was considered part of the training design, but a fair number of district representatives took part in them.

Table D-34: Visits to operating MUSE/IGE schools. At least 30 districts were represented on such visits; about half of these occurred in the spring of 1971 (as preparation for installation of MUSE/IGE), and the other half in fall 1971 (in many cases as a search for implementation assistance). The table shows several different categories of district participants, with superintendents, supervisors, and directors of instruction the most frequent visitors.

Table D-35: Specially arranged staff development for the entire staff of the school(s). Such meetings were participated in by reading specialists as well as district administrative personnel.

Table D-36: League-sponsored general training or meetings as well as special statewide or regional reading conferences are included here. Some 16 superintendents and 30 other district personnel reported attendance at the former, while 19 reading specialists and 7 other persons participated in the latter.

Table D-37: Special conferences at the district level (for general purposes) and also miscellaneous other activities are reported in this table. A number of districts held the former--between 10 and 15--while only 2 districts reported other meetings.

(E) In a final attempt to put district attendance at training opportunities into a framework, we chose three combinations for study, covering selected meetings from among the 15 previously discussed. For these three combinations the percentage range of district attendance is 2% to 23%. Other groupings might yield different indications of participation, but these seemed the most important to check on since attendance at so many kinds of meetings was neither required nor expected. In any case--as also noted with respect to attendance at the first five "standard" sorts of meetings and workshops--district participation is at a low level compared with the opportunities available.

Combination #1.....2 Districts (or 2%) attended

a. Any 1 of -National Overview
   -State Commitment
   -Local Commitment
b. Either of -School leader training
   -School staff training
c. Either of -June reading workshop
   -July reading institute
d. Visit(s) to operating MUSE/IGE schools
e. League or linkage meeting (state, regional, large city)

Combination #2.....9 Districts (or 8%) attended.

a. Any 1 of -National Overview
-State Commitment
-Local Commitment
b. Either of -School leader training
-School staff training
c. Either of -Visits to operating MUSE/IGE schools
-League or linkage meeting (state,region,city)

Combination #3.....23 Districts (or 21%) attended.

a. Any 1 of -National Overview
-State Commitment
-Local Commitment
b. Either of -School leader training
-School staff training
c. Either of -Visits to operating MUSE/IGE schools
-League or linkage meeting (state, region,city)
d. Any 1 of -Special meeting for reading personnel
-Special local staff development for school staff
-Other unspecified meeting, workshop, conference

There were, overall, three sets of meetings and workshops listed in the district questionnaire: a) the standard set of five national, state, and local meetings which were considered the training chain; b) the four stated training sessions conducted by the R & D Center; and c) the miscellaneous workshops and meetings held at the option of the school, district, or linkage group.

Among these three categories, district participation was highest at the standard set of five meetings. For four of these, attendance accounted for between 29% and 39% of the 112 districts; 67% of the districts were represented at the fifth, the state-level meeting for commitment of districts to the new patterns. Second in terms of attendance was the miscellaneous set of activities, where visits to operating schools and attendance at League functions were the most popular. This attendance, however, represented participation by fewer than 35% of the districts in all. As for the stated sessions at the R & D Center, very few districts reported participation, with the June reading workshop ranking highest in attendance.

Activities and Policies Supportive of MUSE/IGE Implementation

(A) Districts were asked two questions concerning student-teachers. First, whether or not there is district policy concerning their involvement in MUSE/IGE schools. Table D-38 reports "Yes" to this question for 26 districts (or 23%). Many of the 77% of districts answering "No" indicated with

marginal notes that they have student teachers, in fact have to work hard to get them, but that there is no particular policy involved. The second question, also reported in Table D-38, was whether the district has or foresees a special relationship with teacher-training institutions relating to MUSE/IGE. Some 71 (or 63%) answered "Yes" to this question. One may infer from these findings that districts generally have student-teachers, have or plan arrangements with institutions, but do not have particular policies in this regard which differentiate their MUSE/IGE schools from traditional schools.

(B) The same relationship obtains with respect to evaluation of the MUSE/IGE patterns: there is a good deal more reported activity than there are policies or requirements governing such evaluation activity. Table D-39 shows that 63% of districts report some evaluation effort this school year, whether formal or informal; but that 17% report the existence of district "policy or requirements concerning MUSE/IGE evaluation and/or accountability."

Of the 71 districts experiencing some form of evaluation, Table D-40 shows the agencies responsible and the formal or informal nature of the activity. Evaluation by the district (research group or other means) was most frequently reported: 24% of districts on a formal basis, 27% on an informal basis, and another 5% with both formal and informal evaluation in progress. Other relatively popular entries were: state department of education activity in 24% of these districts, on an informal basis; formal Title I-III and college projects in 15% and 17% of the districts, respectively.

Fourteen districts reported both formal and informal activities being undertaken, and approximately 30 of the districts reported evaluation programs by more than one agency. No information was obtained concerning the actual nature of the programs involved.

(C) Districts were further asked to indicate whether inservice activities "specifically related to MUSE/IGE installation" had taken place "under the sponsorship or direction of the district" during the school year. Cross-checking reveals that there is some confusion between inservice training conducted by a school and that allowed (in terms of money or time) by the district. Where feasible, such conflicting entries were omitted and attention is directed to district activities in Table D-41 and D-42. Although

the questions and the whole instrument are directed to MUSE/IGE-related functions, it appears likely that districts reported as much on general policy and activities as on ones specifically related to MUSE/IGE.

Table D-41 reports the 57 (or 51%) districts which indicated having such activities. Another 21% replied that there was no such training but that some was planned for later in the year. Finally, 28% indicated no activities and no plans. Table D-41 also reports that 50% of the districts "have defined policy concerning inservice activities"; this usually meant released-time for training or budgetary allowance for time and materials.

In Table D-42 we see the breakdown of inservice efforts among the 57 districts reporting such activity. Some 37% of these report sponsorship of a 1-day inservice program, and another 25% sponsorship of half-day sessions. Also, 25% indicate district sponsorship of a credit course.

The most frequent kind of assistance (33 districts or 58% of those with activities) was the availability of district personnel for assistance to school staffs as resource person at unit or IIC meetings. In view of the general nature--and wide applicability--of such consultative assistance, this might be judged a small percentage of districts with personnel so engaged.

(D) A more general--and open-ended--question was also asked about the nature of assistance provided by district personnel to individual schools in the form of leadership, consultation, resources, or support. As Table D-43 reveals, a perhaps surprising number of respondents made no substantive response: 54 (or 48%) of districts either left the item blank or, as in many cases, wrote in the word "none." Response content was studied and the activities rather easily fell into seven categories. The 2 most frequent categories (each mentioned by about 20%) were a) lead or sponsor training and b) consultation and support in solving implementation problems. The other five categories were reported by between 7% and 13% of the districts.

In all, the total of 96 assistance activities reported for this item occurred in 58 districts.

Impacts and Other Comments

(A) Respondents were asked to indicate particular impacts--at the district level--related to the installation of MUSE/IGE, and they were also asked to amplify briefly on each checked item. A list of nine was provided with space for entering others. Study of the content revealed that a) many respondents reported facts or events (e.g., "There was a news article in

October" or "Yes, we use standardized tests.") and b) many others checked items without amplifying on them. It was therefore decided to tabulate only those which in the compiler's subjective view could be counted as "real" impacts. These were outcomes or decisions or possibly plans which could be considered the result of introducing and implementing MUSE/IGE.

Table D-44 reports on the resulting numbers. A total of 75 districts reported no impacts. Another 24 districts each reported one impact; 10 districts reported two each; and 3 districts described three impacts each. Thus, the result is a small number of impacts in each of the nine topical areas outlined. It should be remembered, though, that instruments were completed in the third to sixth month of implementation, and thus the impacts reported are probably only suggestive of what might be true after a full year or into the second year.

The most frequent impact reported was modification to buildings--in 13 districts of the 37 with positive replies. (Table D-45 outlines the number of districts with each sort of impact). The other eight areas were marked by 10 or fewer districts each, but of more than usual interest may be the fact that grading systems and standardized testing programs have apparently already been affected. Overall, among the 37 districts there was a total of 53 impacts.

(B) Other comments were also invited. They were few but they were illuminating. Their general tenor was divided among these several sentiments: a) state department of education (2 states) assistance was minimal and teacher organizations have been somewhat negative; b) preparation in advance (voluntary summer work and preschool workshops) is indispensable; c) districts have been "short of help" and thus schools have had to make it on their own; and d) there are plans afoot to extend MUSE/IGE into other district schools next year and the year after. These can hardly be taken to represent all districts or any group of districts, but they reveal an interesting range of concerns and observations.

CHAPTER V

DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

This "questionnaire" actually consisted of several parts directed to various individuals and groups at a 20% sample of the schools. The parts were related in content, style, and overall structure, and were sent to school people at the same time. Separate instruments were prepared for the following:

Principal	Librarian/IMC Director
Unit Teachers	IGE Subject Specialist

Each Unit as a Group
IIC as a Group

The detailed implementation data were gathered for several purposes. First, to amplify certain of the gross findings from the earlier survey questionnaire to all schools. This relates primarily to the IIC, unit structure, multiaging, and IGE subject-area(s). Second, to explore the dynamics and dimensions of the installation process in terms of detailed attention to the implementation criteria. This would allow certain conclusions regarding the extent and apparent success of the venture in these schools. And third, to examine the problems and processes from the points of view of the total school staff (as individuals and as groups). This provides a way of assessing reactions to training and installation as well as seeing the range of individual operations.

These purposes are bound together in two ways within the instruments. In the first place, each individual was asked to respond to the same small group of questions; this "common response" page provides an opportunity for constrasting reactions and preferences of principals, teachers, unit leaders, librarians, and IGE subject-area specialists.

Secondly, twelve areas of concern were selected for emphasis (as outlined in Chapter II), and these are reflected throughout the questionnaires for various persons and groups. For example, one emphasis is "an active IIC." The IIC operation is explored in its own group instrument, and various IIC aspects are then asked about in the principal's questionnaire, the unit's group questionnaire, and the individual teacher's questionnaire. These 12 areas represent fundamental criteria related to successful progress in the first year. They are all interpreted as inputs; that is, they

are actions, conditions, or decisions which are perceived as directly related to satisfactory status. These have been isolated from several sources: the R & D overall criteria, advice from 1971-72 school practitioners, and study of other materials (including school visits). They are virtually absolute criteria in our view, the sine qua non of the facilitating environment which in turn will allow effective individualized education to thrive. And such education in the focus of the whole installation effort.

This approach is related directly to project purposes, since detailed implementation data are required in order to study the extent to which schools are meeting important criteria as set forth in the guidelines.

A very brief instrument was also administered to a representative of each district covering the sample schools. This was intended to get at the district's relationships with its installing schools and also asks the respondent about his personal reaction to MUSE/IGE.

Selection of the Sample

Schools were not selected (on any random or other basis) so that findings and interpretations could be generalized to the total group of schools. Such was never the intention, and as it turned out there were other considerations precluding random selection and generalization of findings.

In all, 68 schools were selected across 8 states: Illinois (12), Ohio (8), Connecticut (8), Wisconsin (13), Colorado (9), South Carolina (7), Minnesota (7), and Indiana (4). Nebraska and California were included only in the first survey questionnaire step. It was planned to have 7 New Jersey schools in the sample, but as noted elsewhere, that state's installation schedule made administration of this questionnaire inappropriate. Schools were chosen on the basis of meeting certain restrictive criteria, and after that on the basis of including certain variations in status or practice. These criteria are outlined below:

1. All 24 schools on the site-visit schedule were included.
2. For all remaining schools, the principal must have responded to the first questionnaire prior to follow-up
3. Ratios by state were determined on the basis of total number of schools on all initial rosters.
4. Based upon first-questionnaire data, schools were then chosen to represent both
   a. first and second semester installation
   b. rural, suburban, and inner-city schools
   c. very large, medium, and very small schools
   d. slow-implementing and fast-implementing schools

Wherever possible, special features were also taken into account; e.g., a school with one unit, a school which omitted preschool workshop, a school with no IIC, a school with unit inservice, a school with much schoolwide inservice, a campus school, etc.

While 68 is hardly a 20% sample of 205 schools, it is fairly close to 20% of the original 287 schools initially included on all rosters. It was necessary to select the sample prior to receiving all returns from the first questionnaire, and the figure 68 was arrived at by first determining the rough 20% number (57) and then adding a few spares in order to insure a satisfactory return of approximately 50 schools. Second-semester schools were included.

Administration and Response

The sets of questionnaires were mailed to principals, who were requested to distribute the materials. Packets were sent in the last week of April, but with different requested return dates for the 57 fall schools and the 11 spring schools. Follow-up was conducted by mailing a reminder letter which stated that we would send a new packet if the original had been mislaid.

Responses were received from 60 schools, with 8 abstaining altogether. Of these 60, 53 were fall-installing schools and 7 were from the spring group. All 902 individual responses were analyzed and are discussed in this chapter, with the following totals for each subgroup:

Principals..... 55 (from 55 schools) *
Unit Leaders.....192 (from 56 schools)
Teachers.....592 (from 59 schools)
Librarian/IMC..... 39 (from 39 schools)
IGE Specialist..... 24 (from 23 schools)

Obviously, not all possible respondents replied from each given school. Using responses from principal, IIC group, and 60% of teachers as a criterion, we judged that 49 schools had sent in "complete" returns. Thus, there were returns from 60 schools in all, with 49 completes and 11 partials.

In addition to 902 individual returns, group responses were:

IIC..... 52 (from 52 schools)
Teaching Units.....208 (from 59 schools)

Responses were received from 32 district representatives.

---

* These numbers are for groups who completed the "Common Response" items, where the total of 902 will be mentioned frequently. These figures are used for convenience, to describe the usual sizes of responding groups. However, for certain items there were more or fewer respondents, and wherever feasible the largest number will be used.

Findings

The findings are reported for the separate categories of persons and groups, across the complete response range...whether or not a school's total response was considered complete. For present purposes, fall and spring responses are not separated, primarily because the spring group is so small. For the same reason, analysis was not done by state; the largest number of returns from a given state was 12. For the groups responding, the numbers will be very different, and will always be indicated. Where particular items were omitted by a response group, this will also be shown.

Across the set of instruments a few items are not reported on here. Certain items were included as a basis for cross-checking or relating responses from different sources, and others for amplification of findings from the first questionnaire.

The reader is reminded that the second questionnaire packet was administered in May 1972. In effect, for both fall and spring groups, the returns represent MUSE/IGE status at the end of the school year, which means the first year of installation activities. A few items required retrospective looks by respondents, but most were in terms of common practice throughout the year and present reactions or judgements.

The instruments are located in Appendix E, and the data tables in Appendix F.

District Representative

Response was fairly light among district personnel receiving this short instrument (yellow). In all, 32 returns were received and are treated here. However, 41 schools were represented by these district responses. This includes 4 in Indiana (where, for our purposes, all are located in Indianapolis) and a few districts with two sample schools. For 26 districts, just 1 school was in the sample. Returns were received from at least 3 districts in each of the states, except as noted for Indiana.

Questionnaire data are recorded in Tables M-1 to M-5. Just over half of the responding districts had previously returned the first questionnaire. This, added to the current response number of 32, makes it impracticable to attempt comparisons between "then and now" on district items.

Table M-1 reports responses to four brief items. On a Yes-No basis, fewer than half the districts (15 of 32) reported having a central policy group by year's end. As noted above, most districts have just one MUSE/IGE school. The table also shows that fewer than half (13 of 32) plan to expand MUSE/IGE within the district in 1972-73.

As to the assignment of a liaison person or local coordinator, the great majority of districts (29) reported that this has been accomplished. In relating number of coordinators to number of governing groups, the implication is that either the local coordinator acts on his own authority or reports directly to an administrator without a board or committee as an intermediary group. Many of the respondents, of course, were themselves the appointed local liaison.

As also indicated in Table M-1, all but one reported use of an implementation guide in furthering MUSE/IGE purposes. Table M-2 indicates the relative use of 4 of these guides. The two other volumes, one from I/D/E/A and one from the R & D Center, are apparently used with greater frequency than the R & D revisions produced in the fall and winter of this year. Among the 31 persons reporting such use, 16 checked 1 guide, while between 4 and 6 checked 2, 3, or 4 guides. Perhaps a more important question is how the guides are employed. Table M-2 also reports this, showing their heaviest use as reference sources or aids (28 persons), with decreasing frequency of use for the other purposes outlined.

Guide used as reference source or aid.....28
Guide used as checklist for completed activities..18
Guide used for assessing status and progress.....13
Guide used for recording projected dates, accomplishment dates, and plans..... 7

Fourteen respondents indicated 1 use for the guide(s), and this was most often as a reference source. Six respondents checked all four types of utilization. It can be inferred that in this population the guides are fairly well known, are often used as companion documents, and are widely employed for several purposes related to installation. However, their most frequent use as a reference or aid leaves other possible uses somewhat wanting--and those uses are ones which involve direct use, checklists, entries of dates and information, and evaluation.

Table M-3 reports ratings made of the guides on two variables. As to their usefulness in terms of "providing or clarifying long-range goals," 10 respondents checked Excellent, 19 Good, and 3 Moderate. The same held true

on the question of usefulness in the first implementation year, with 10 indicating Excellent and 22 rating the guides as Good. Among this group there were no ratings of Fair or Poor.

Table M-4 lists the various kinds of assistance provided to new MUSE/IGE schools by any district person or group. In only one case did fewer than half check a given item, and that was in connection with adjusting the district's testing program to the school's new patterns. The largest number (28 in each case) checked "promoting continuous progress as a strategy" and "acquiring multiple materials." In this sample, districts provided assistance on a large scale across many topics. The nature of the assistance is not spelled out and was defined in the instrument as even "giving support or approval." At the least, these districts are apparently providing a climate of support to the new schools. Only one district indicated NO assistance, and two reported 3 sorts of help; the remainder checked 4 or more entries, with 6 reporting activity in all 12 areas of assistance listed.

Table M-5 reports on a related topic, the policies and guidelines enunciated by the district (through any means). Using number of responses as a criterion, the matter of greatest policy concern was the responsibilities of aides (71%), and the item of least mention was evaluation of the MUSE/IGE schools or of particular outcomes in them (37%). Three respondents indicated NO policies, and one checked just 1 area; the remainder reported 2 or more areas, with 5 persons checking all 8 topics. Considering that each topic was indicated by a minimum of 37% of the respondents, it would appear that these districts as a group have stated official positions on a variety of topics which are believed to be important to implementation success. We do not know whether policy statements or special guidelines predominated.

The final item asked for the respondent's personal feeling about MUSE and IGE, separately, on a four-point scale: Cautious, Neutral, Agreeable, Enthusiastic. Half the group (16) indicated ENTHUSIASTIC for both MUSE and IGE, at both the beginning of the school year and in May. Another 9 indicated moving from Agreeable to Enthusiastic for both areas. Thus, over three-fourths (25) reported an enthusiastic end-of-year attitude toward both MUSE and IGE. Three reported a Cautious or Neutral initial feeling, and these all moved to Agreeable. The remainder began and stayed at Agreeable. Overall, the attitude among those who responded was strongly an enthusiastic one.

IMC Director, Librarian, or Media Specialist

In all, 49 responses were received. However, 9 of these (18%) were from principals who indicated that their schools had no library or media center. (And another indicated having a facility but no staff for it). Thus, 40 returns were usable and constitute the basis for analysis here. At least 4 responses came in from each state. The main concerns of this brief instrument (goldenrod) were the role of the librarian and changes planned in the facility. Data are reported in Tables M-6 to M-9, and can be used to expand to a degree the general interpretation derived from the first questionnaire. With one exception, respondents are from schools whose principals completed that earlier instrument (though of course the present data are from only a sample of schools).

With respect to their roles in the school, Table M-6 shows that 16 (40%) indicated membership in the IIC. Of the 24 who were not members, 8 sometimes attended IIC meetings, but 16 never did. (It is presumed that this means they were not invited, since they were not members to begin with).

They were asked directly whether they should be IIC members and what advantages or disadvantages they saw, and responses varied somewhat. ALL those who were members also indicated that the librarian/IMC director should be on the IIC, and all saw distinct advantages. In order of frequency of mention, these included: a) being better informed, b) being able to relate materials to unit studies, c) having a "different" point of view to bring to the IIC, and d) providing better service to teachers. Among the non-members, the same feelings were expressed by the majority, including the view that IIC membership was desirable and important. However, disadvantages and reservations were expressed by a few: a) the IMC accomplishes more in unit meetings, b) "It would take me away from my library," and c) attendance on occasion is more important than membership.

Overall, the large majority favored IIC membership, noted more good reasons and advantages than disadvantages, and felt that as a member, the librarian/IMC person could be of greater service to the school. Expressed in negative terms, several indicated that the IIC overlooks what the IMC and its librarian/director can contribute to the program.

To the inquiry whether changes or new provisions had been made this year specifically in relation to MUSE/IGE adoption, Table M-7 shows a 50-50 split. It also shows almost equal mention of what those changes were

in the 19 Yes schools: increased space, increased staff, materials and supplies, greater accessibility of materials, and better utilization of space--with smaller mention of relocation within the building. The 21 No responders were asked about plans for next year. Eight indicated no specific plans and another 5 reported that no changes or additions were needed. Among the remainder, 3 indicated more space, 2 mentioned materials, 1 happily announced an aide forthcoming, and one (sadly?) wrote merely, "Some games."

Considering the potential need for improved facilities and materials in MUSE/IGE programs, the responses indicating "no changes next year" are important because of their frequency. On the other hand, half the schools polled indicated that (some) needs had indeed been taken care of for this year.

Table M-8 reports on typical use of the facility by children, an extension of a question in the first instrument. The table shows highest frequency (32 and 31) for "controlled" and scheduled use of the facility, and for instructional use under supervision. The freer sorts of use (work and study without schedules or permits) were less frequently checked (18 and 19 schools). Respondents indicated more than one choice, so a further breakdown may be useful. Of the 40 schools, 19 indicated use only in categories a) and/or b), the controlled utilization patterns--and 3 schools reported use only in categories c) and/or d). The remaining 18 schools reported both structured and free access to the facility. Thus no single pattern emerges, but from a certain point of view it can be concluded that the most typical approach is a conservative one.

Table M-9 reports the rough percentages of time spent in the schools at certain specified tasks. These are presented in increments of 10%. For management responsibilities (materials and children), staff respondents report from NONE of their time to 90%, with greatest concentration in the 50% and 60% intervals. By contrast, no other activity takes as much time (90%) or has such frequencies in the middle and upper percentage brackets. The second most time-consuming activity is "stocking with materials, books, supplies," and the third appears to be "instructing in the use of the facility." These are likely fairly standard activities in most libraries. Two areas that might be increasingly important in MUSE/IGE schools took considerably less time across this group: developing resource files for instructional units, and attending unit meetings for instructional reasons. For these areas, the majority indicated NO time or up to 10% of their time.

Questions dealing with attitudes, reactions, and suggestions will be included, for all respondents, in the section on Common Response.

Specialist in IGE Subject-area

A grand total of 49 responses was received, representing 40 schools. Eight schools indicated having no such subject specialist (or special teacher), and 17 returns were completed by physical education, music, and art teachers. There obviously had been a confusion of "special-subject teacher" and "IGE subject specialist." This left 24 returns usable, which constitute the basis for analysis.

Of these 24, 17 were specialists in reading, 2 in mathematics, and 1 each in science and social studies. Three curriculum specialists were included since their roles covered "general" IGE subject-areas. The basic questions concerned IIC membership and distribution of time among these specialists.

Table M-10 shows that 10 (or 41%) reported membership in the IIC; 6 indicated non-membership and occasional attendance at meetings; and 7 non-members reported no such attendance. On the question of membership preference, a large majority indicated advantages in being a regular part of the IIC (for reasons of curriculum continuity, personal involvement, problem-solving). A few held that occasional attendance would be satisfactory, and only one indicated a definite preference for non-membership. As with librarians, these specialists who are outside the formal unit structure feel as a group that they could and should contribute to the program through membership in the IIC of the school.

Table M-11 outlines the specialists' activities, in intervals of 10% of their time. The item taking most time in the group is teaching children; 7 indicated more than 70% of their time in this activity...which suggests that they may be teachers "specializing in the subject" as opposed to being specialists for the school. The other activities are engaged in up to 40% of time, by a few individuals, but the great majority spend NO time in them or up to 10%. These categories include: conducting inservice training, monitoring IGE progress, materials, attending unit meetings, and developing teaching/testing materials. Nine individuals reported time spread across all 6 activities. The role of the specialist has not been specifically defined, so far as we know, but these activities and findings may be helpful to some planners.

Questions dealing with attitudes, reactions, and suggestions will be included, for all respondents, in the section on Common Response.

Principals

The 56 principals who responded completed most items; we will use 56 as the total N for this analysis.

Several questions were asked in relation to unit leaders. The first had to do with aspects of their selection. Table M-12 reports the dates when unit leaders were assigned (or otherwise selected) to that role. For the fall-semester group of 50 schools, this varied from late 1970 to the last quarter of 1971. In most schools they had been appointed by the end of June 1971, but assignment still took place after the reported date of installation. The same is true for the spring group; while in two schools the leaders were appointed in the previous spring, in two others assignment took place in May 1972 (after reported installation). All 56 principals reported that once selected, unit leaders were assigned to that role for the whole school year.

Table M-13 shows that 36 (or 64%) of the principals reported directly selecting the unit leaders. Among this group, 14 different bases for selection were indicated, as shown in Table M-14. Principals were asked to check no more than five in order for the highest priorities to be apparent. (Four respondents checked more than 5 items, but the great majority marked 4 or 5 of the choices). It is easy to see which items were scarcely or never used as selection criteria (disciplinarian, seniority, graduate degree, request to be considered). It's not as easy to pinpoint the priorities, though, since only one item (professional rapport with teaching associates) was marked by as many as 78% of the group responding. Five items were checked by 50% or more of the group.

The five factors ranking highest within this group were:

Professional rapport with teaching associates
Degree of commitment to new patterns
Energy and enthusiasm
General teaching experience (length & variety)
Imaginativeness and flexibility in the use of methods and materials

These were not unanimous criteria by any means, but together they do reflect the principal's search for leadership potential, commitment, and good teaching. It is interesting to note the items which received less emphasis: generally best teacher of a grade, team teaching experience, experience with individualized programs, and rapport with the principal.

Among the 20 principals who did not directly select unit leaders, several approaches were reported, although in very little detail. The most frequent was (s)election by the unit, which suggests that in at least those 12 schools units were formed prior to choice of the leader. In 5 other instances, the unit plus principal made the selection (no further information), while in one a staff sociogram was used, and in 2 others the elementary supervisor made the selection (no criteria indicated). One can easily imagine the wide range of local situations that make various approaches expedient. The R & D Center guide calls for selection by the principal and lists several particular criteria. It has not been possible for all schools to follow that model.

Table M-15 reveals that 21 principals (37%) were expecting to replace unit leaders for the 1972-73 year. In most cases just 1 would be replaced, but there were as many as 2 or 4 also reported. The reasons given for the change cover an interesting range, with the most frequent being the unit leader's moving away. These explanations are outlined below.

Reason for Change	Number of Cases
Unit Leader moving away	7
Unit Leader request to be relieved	4
Reorganization into larger units	3
Annual re-election of unit leaders	2
Poor rapport with unit; domineering	3
Unit leader being promoted elsewhere	1
"Shift in personnel"	1

From the point of view of effective use of personnel, reassigning unit leaders at their request is no doubt a good thing, and of course all principals are faced with the prospect of enforced reassignment for morale or professional reasons. (That last reason may explain the personnel shift listed in the chart).

Finally, principals were asked to rate unit leaders on a number of the qualities which would seem desirable in order for them to be effective. Table M-16 outlines the results, using a scale of Poorly, Adequately, and Well to define effectiveness. Principals as a group are clearly well satisfied with "their" unit leaders. While every cell in the table (ratings vs qualities) contains entries, at least 50% of all unit leaders are rated Well for each activity. Thus, each percentage in the ratings for Well exceeds those under Adequate; likewise, the Adequate ratings in every case much outweigh those entered under Poor.

Overall, the ratings for top performance are roughly equal in terms of percentages, although two characteristics rise above the others just a little: i) practices good teaching approaches and j) makes use of opportunities to perfect own skills. Among the features rated as Poor, just two approach 10% of the total group of 222 unit leaders: e) manages the instructional program in the IGE subject(s), and g) leads constructive unit meetings.

Just a few observations about how principals responded. Three of them rated all their unit leaders as doing Well in all areas, and one rated them all as Adequate across the board. Otherwise, 34 entered them in two ratings (always Adequate and Well), while 18 principals reported all 3 levels of performance. Fifteen principals ranked all unit leaders in the same way (even with as many as 6 leaders to consider), which may suggest a fairly hasty assessment.

As noted, overall the sentiment was that unit leaders fulfilled their many responsibilities well (and this is reflected in the relatively small number who will be replaced--see Table M-15). Using gross figures for each school, there were 15 schools with a general rating of Adequate, 34 with a rating of Well, 1 with a "bimodal" distribution of Well and Poor, and 6 schools with roughly equal responses for Well and Adequate.

On the subject of the grouping of staff teachers, Table M-17 shows that equal proportions of schools (30%) accomplished this through direct assignment by principal and automatic grouping by grade levels. The remainder, in order of frequency, arranged grouping through these means: self-selection by teachers, assignment by the IIC, selection by unit leaders, and self-selection combined with principal selection. Under "other," one school indicated selection by the elementary supervisor, and another reported assignment by the school board.

The overwhelming majority of principals indicated satisfaction with the method used in grouping staff teachers (51, or 91%).

In relation to this, principals were also asked whether there had been opportunity to determine teachers' wishes and competiencies in relation to the MUSE/IGE patterns; 49 (89%) indicated Yes to this item. On the question whether teachers had been provided a means for indicating their commitment (or reservations), 50 (90%) responded with a Yes answer. Apparently in the majority of cases, placement of teachers was given some careful consideration, and their level of commitment was estimated.

There were bound to arise cases of teachers' being unready. We asked principals to indicate what provisions had been made and Table M-18 describes these "allowances." The most frequent was delay of the IGE subject in a room or unit (in 10 schools), and other relatively frequent provisions included: a) self-contained classroom, b) departmentalization, and c) transfer of teachers. Obviously the last was not an example of flexibility as asked for in the item. All other entries, however, do reflect assistance or other provisions for "waiting for teacher readiness."

The range of topics which gave particular difficulty (of a continuing or serious nature) and which thereby inhibited implementation is reported in Table M-19. This list was given only to principals to respond to. Among the total group, the problem most often indicated was teachers' overworking (checked by 50%). It is ironic that their "burning-out" in efforts to make the program work is perceived as a deterrent at the same time. The next important problem (43%) was the domain of inservice: content, time for, frequency, relevance. And the next two (at 36% of principals each) related to personnel: a) confusion over roles and b) teamwork and sharing. Interestingly, the item least checked (by just 2 principals) was "a sizable number of teachers not committed." Apparently, though many indicated elsewhere an awareness of lack of commitment, the problem usually resides in a very small proportion of the staff. Other items are recorded in the table, including several write-ins.

Of equal interest is the number of problems reported, remembering the admonition to check only continuing and serious difficulties. The chart below provides this information, showing 3 problem areas as the most typical number reported, with a range from None to 8.

Number of Problems	Number of Principals	Number of Problems	Number of Principals
None	1	5	6
1	6	6	8
2	9	7	0
3	13	8	1
4	11		

Table M-20 outlines the principal's range of activities in reply to the question, "Do you now do more of any of the following than before...MUSE/IGE?" Eight activities were checked by between 55% and 83% of the group, topped by "delegating instructional/curricular decisions." Another set of 3 items were

marked by less than half the group, and this included the report that 17 principals teach children more often now. The final set of 3 items--discipline problems, routine management, and meetings of the full staff--were included in the list in order to have a comparison base; these were checked by only a few, between 5% and 14% of the group. It would appear that these principals are engaged to a greater degree now in activities related to the instructional program. In that connection, two-thirds of the group marked 6 or more of the items listed.

Table M-21 reports on a matter of some moment so far as definition is concerned. Earlier discussion has noted some difficulty in determining dates of installation; and a related concern has been whether schools (and districts) mark their beginning point in terms of MUSE or of IGE factors. Principals were asked to mark ONE act or circumstance in a list of 12 which best defined the point after which they considered their schools actually to be "MUSE/IGE schools."

Eleven of the 12 statements were checked and 3 others were entered under "other"--for a total of 14 different ways of defining the "beginning point." (All principals had the same question and the same list of options). The choices ranged in potential date from somewhere long before children could feel the MUSE/IGE differences to a point possibly long after school was in session. More important than time differences, perhaps, are the activity differences, ranging from a decision, to a committee meeting, to a type of training, to assessment of pupil status.

The most frequent beginning point was the "organization of teachers and children into functioning units," but even this was marked by only 23% of the principals. Other "popular" criteria were the decision by the staff to become committed and the Preschool Workshop. Several items were indicated by one principal each--emphasizing the lack of unanimity on this question and the lack of clarity in being able to determine the "true starting point." From a point of view that looks at end-results (after some months or a year) this question may be somewhat academic, but from an accounting point of view it is of some importance. It would also seem to have a bearing on training content and community information efforts, as well as on certain major curricular decisions.

As Table M-21 shows, 5 responses were not tallied. Three principals checked more than 1 option (as many as 7 in one case), and 2 others said, in effect, "There was no such point. We were already organized earlier." That is even harder to rationalize than having 5 or 7 conflicting criteria all at once!

In summary, the criteria indicated for the beginning point of MUSE/IGE installation are indeed diverse. For their own situations they may all be "right," but they certainly are also different.

* * * * * * * *

Principals were asked to briefly define the most important goals which they had set for this year, and to indicate extent of accomplishment by year's end (on a scale of Little, Partial, and Complete accomplishment). Most described two goals, and some three. The 43 resulting topics are organized into subgroupings in the charts on the next two pages. Out of a total of 131 mentions, 10 were rated as accomplished to a Little extent, 75 as Partial, and 46 as Complete.

Goals most frequently listed (6 or more times) were establishment of MUSE, staff commitment, teams working together, and implementing IGE in one subject. For these topics, all ratings except two were Partial or Complete.

Not surprisingly, the areas most often mentioned were ones concerned with instructional and organizational factors (MUSE and IGE), with other subgroupings ancillary in some way. The wide range of topics speaks for itself in its diversity, but aside from the emphases involved there is one other observation. A great many of these goals show that principals recognized the long-range efforts involved in installation; we see many purposes set for accomplishment in the first year which suggest the need for <u>continuing</u> efforts rather than static fulfillment. Moreover, certain basic elements (such as an effective IIC, staff commitment, multiaging the units, to name a few) were perceived by some principals as factors to work on during the first year rather than to assume as accomplished at the outset. In other words, some of the features presumed by guidelines and common understanding to be present at initiation of MUSE/IGE--were in some cases set as year-end goals.

Principals were also asked to list major goals for the coming year. In a number of cases, they repeated the list already indicated for the

GOALS FOR 1971-72 LISTED BY PRINCIPALS
AND REPORTED EXTENT OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

	Little	Some	All	*
Organizational Factors				
1. Establish MUSE organization		4	8	
2. Organize all aspects of new operations		2	2	
3. Good public relations			2	
4. Scheduling and organization of units			1	
5. Develop Resource Center		1		2
6. Effective use of Learning Center and materials		1		1
7. Develop school's educational goals and objectives	1	1		3
8. Change the building's structure		1	1	
9. Better use of all sorts of specialists			1	
10. Arrange adequate planning time for teachers	1			2
11. Evaluate the new program--all aspects		1		1
12. Establish effective IIC		2	2	5
Parent Communication				
13. Sell concepts to parents		1		
14. Get parents to visit to see school in action		1		
15. Good communication with parents			1	1
16. Parental acceptance and involvement		3	1	
Staff Involvement, Communication, Commitment				
17. Sell concepts to staff; accept philosophy; commitment		4	4	1
18. Learn to operate comfortably within MUSE/IGE		1		
19. Each teacher develop his own strengths		2		
20. Involve total staff in decisions			1	
21. Human relations on staff; communication; morale		4		8
Inservice Training				
22. Train unit leaders and teachers	1	1		
23. Set priorities for inservice		1		
24. Use the inservice materials	1	1		2
25. Inservice for all new teachers		1		
Teacher Flexibility				
26. Moving teachers out of "their" rooms			1	
27. Teachers allow pupils to make decisions		1		
28. Teachers use behavioral objectives	2	1		
29. Teachers organize and teach more flexibly		3		
Children				
30. Understand children as humans, learners			1	
31. Children develop positive attitudes toward school		2	1	1

* Indicates goals listed by principals for 1972-73 school year.

GOALS FOR 1971-72 (continued)

	Little	Some	All	*
Unit Operations				
32. Units perform as part of "large unit"		2	2	2
33. Get teams to work, share together--as a team		8	3	2
Instructional Factors				
34. Implement IGE in one subject--any subject area	2	12	10	31
35. Implement IGE in all subjects	1			
36. Instructional programing model in IGE subject		1	1	10
37. Individualize continuous progress	1	1	1	2
38. Establish instructional objectives--continuum		1	1	2
39. Teach skills, not grade-level content		2	1	1
40. Multiage the unit		3		
41. Begin to implement IGE model		2		
42. Prepare for IGE subject next year		2		
43. Explore IGE/MUSE for implementation next year		1		2

* * * * * * * *

ADDITIONAL 1972-73 GOALS LISTED BY PRINCIPALS
(NOT INCLUDED IN CHART ABOVE)

Acquire more needed materials 1
Improve diagnostic teaching 1
Utilize open space to maximum 1
Find money for aides, unit leaders. 1
Develop plans to get student teachers 1
Assess children's needs (diagnosis) 3
Involve parents in establishing pupil objectives. 1
Have pupils understand total reading program. 1
Initiate character education. 1
Review implementation steps not yet attained (guide). 2
Develop ongoing inservice 1
Have each unit operate separately--as a unit. 1
Better ways to record and report student progress 5
Establish learning centers in the units 1
Include Kg in multiaged unit. 1
Use of various learning modes 1
Smaller instructional groups. 2
Make MUSE/IGE show academic progress. 1
Principal to be in units--observe, teach. 1

current school year, but most supplied additional ones. And across the total group, of course, the lists are quite similar as principals mention goals previously referred to by other respondents.

The charts on the previous two pages present these "new" goals, in two ways. Where the 1972-73 goals are the same as earlier ones, they are shown in the column to the right. Where the new goals had not previously been indicated, they are listed separately, again with frequencies noted. The emphases shift a little in the second list, perhaps reflecting changes in priorities based on first-year experiences, with greater concern for:

Using the instructional programing system in IGE subject
Developing schoolwide goals
Establishing an effective IIC
Human relations on the staff; communication and morale
Assessing children's needs (insructional diagnosis)
Recording and reporting progress of students

The topic most often listed was "Implement IGE in one subject," and this was usually shown by naming the subject area. In virtually all 31 cases, this meant addition of a second subject to the one already initiated.

* * * * * *

In order to get at the "affective atmosphere," principals were asked to rate <u>total</u> staff attitude toward the multiunit and individually-guided education patterns (as of May 1972) using a four-point scale: Cautious, Neutral, Agreeable, Enthusiastic. Findings may be analyzed first by scale-points indicated for any staff, and second by percentage weights.

The following chart shows the range of reported attitudes across 55 schools responding and across <u>both</u> MUSE and IGE. Each row represents the categories into which principals placed any staff, regardless of percentages. Thus, in 19 schools, entries were made at all four points--while in 6 schools, all staff were rated Enthusiastic for both patterns.

CAUTIOUS	NEUTRAL	AGREEABLE	ENTHUSIASTIC	Number of Schools
x	x	x	x	19
x	x	x		3
x	x		x	1
x		x	x	6
	x	x	x	7
	x	x		1
		x		1
		x	x	11
			x	6

Further examination of the chart reveals that the general feeling--as perceived by principals--was toward the positive end of the scale. For example, the last 3 entries show that total staffs were rated as Agreeable and/or Enthusiastic by 18 principals. Indeed, in 26 schools no staff members were reported to be Cautious, while in only 5 schools were none rated Enthusiastic. On the other hand, of course, it is clear that in 29 schools some staff members were rated as Cautious toward MUSE or IGE. The numbers involved, however, were fairly small as reported in percentage terms.

Analysis of the percentage findings strongly supports the generally positive attitudes indicated above. Concerning MUSE, for example, 20 principals reported some staff members as Cautious at year's end, but in 16 schools the proportions were no higher than 10%. The same was true for IGE. In only one case--for either MUSE or IGE--did the Cautious percentage go above 25%; it was at the 50% mark.

The pattern was repeated for the Neutral rating. In the great majority of cases, 5% or 10% of the staff was reported as feeling Neutral; the highest percentage was again at the 50% level, with several ratings between 25% and 50%.

The Agreeable and Enthusiastic ratings were also very similar. The range--again for both MUSE and IGE--was from none to 100%, with entries at nearly every 5% interval. The major difference was that while from 6 to 9 schools ranked 75% or more of the staff as Agreeable, from 20 to 22 schools ranked 75% or more of the staff as Enthusiastic.

The chart below gives percentage means and ranges for the 4 ratings for each innovation separately.

Multiunit School Organization

	Cautious	Neutral	Agreeable	Enthusiastic
Mean %	5	7	31	57
% Range	0-50	0-50	0-100	0-100

Individually Guided Education

	Cautious	Neutral	Agreeable	Enthusiastic
Mean %	4	7	34	55
% Range	0-25	0-50	0-100	0-100

The pattern was for quite a few principals to indicate Caution or Neutrality for 25% or fewer of the staff, with just about an equal number indicating Agreement and Enthusiasm for 75% or more of the staff.

This was true for both MUSE and IGE ratings. One reason for the similar findings for the two innovations was that half (27) of the principals entered exactly the same percentages for both MUSE and IGE. However, there were also some notable differences, particularly at Agreeable and Enthusiastic levels. Between MUSE and IGE there were percentage disparities between 15% and 100%; these clustered around 50%. For example, one principal reported 90% of his staff enthusiastic about MUSE and 20% enthusiastic about IGE; another reported 60% agreeable about IGE but only 5% agreeable about MUSE, with a resulting 55% disparity. In all, there were 12 instances where such disparities were 50% or higher. The differences balanced out, however, so that neither MUSE nor IGE stood out as affected by the reported disparities. It is of note, though, that in a few schools the staffs were apparently much more favorably inclined to one pattern than the other.

Finally, principals were asked to add any notes or comments; about one-third of them did. The majority of comments had a distinctly positive ring to them, although some principals repeated concerns expressed elsewhere by themselves or others (not enough planning time, need for full staff commitment, principals need better and earlier training, scheduling difficulties). Aside from those which appeared repetitious, here are their responses:

1. Too many visits and too many questionnaires.
2. Kids are making choices now and enjoying school more.
3. We're confident we'll do a better job next year.
4. You can't "play" with IGE...you must be committed.
5. We have been successful because teachers made the decisions.
6. Should have a fulltime IMC director--we need one.
7. This year is really preparation and orientation for next year.
8. Despite a few indifferent teachers, this educational approach has been effective in one year; about 90% of parents were favorable in our written survey.
9. We need outside assistance to evaluate--are we on the right track? Are we on schedule?
10. We began implementation before inservice materials were available; this has not been the best thing to do.
11. Ours is a much better school now because of IGE-MUSE.

Unit Teachers

A total of 776 teachers responded, and completed most items. That figure will be used as the basis for analysis, and is broken down into the

following groups; (a number of art, music, phys ed and miscellaneous teachers are included under "Other." They are retained in the sample since, in some schools, actual units have been formed around the special subjects and in those cases it is difficult to distinguish the units).

Unit Leaders.....	192	(25% of the total)
Staff Teachers....	565	(73% of the total)
Other.....	19	(2% of the total)
	776	

Teachers indicated the levels in their units, which included primary, intermediate, upper intermediate, grades 6-8. In addition, a number reported teaching across several levels. Of greater interest for its MUSE implications, 51 teachers indicated that they taught but one grade level in the K-3 range, and another 40 reported teaching just one grade in the 4-7 range. (These figures do not include the special-subject teachers of music, art, and so on).

Concerning school policy in instituting MUSE/IGE, teachers were asked about two of the "prior" recommended steps in the R & D Center's guidelines. These related to their "having a chance to discuss and explore the plans and rationales of the new patterns" and having the "option of transferring to another school." As the chart below indicates, there was no standard procedure across schools. Just over half reported having had such opportunities prior to installation. Some of those in category (d), of course, were teachers who joined the staff in September (or perhaps later); for them as well as many others, it appears that there was little or no involvement in these decisions.

	N	%
(a) Discuss and Option	408	- 53
(b) Discuss but no Option	149	- 19
(c) Option but no Discussion	60	- 8
(d) Neither Discussion nor Option	117	- 15
(Omit)	42	- 5

Three questions were concerned with attitudes and preferences. As shown in Table M-22, teachers indicated their positive, neutral, or negative feelings about a number of organizational and instructional variables. These variables were selected from the large number of practices recommended by the implementation guide and were meant to include several which might evoke different reactions. Teachers were asked to respond whether or not the items were practiced last school year; in this way the teacher pulse could be felt on a number of important MUSE/IGE elements.

There was considerable variation across items. Positive reactions, for example, are recorded for as few as 29% of the group (teaching large groups of students) to a predictable 95% (having a unit aide). The majority of the 19 items evoked a strong positive response; in every case there were also neutral reactions (typically 20% to 30%) and negative reactions (often fewer than 10%)--among unit leaders, staff teachers, and others.

Eleven items drew over two-thirds of the responses to the positive rating; what is especially notable is that several of these practices are ones which gave many teachers difficulty during the year. These were related to keeping records, promoting continuous progress, working as a unit, differentiated unit responsibilities, assessing pupil progress, and regrouping for instruction. This finding indicates favorable inclination in the group as a whole toward the instructional programing design, in spite of various drawbacks encountered in implementation efforts. (The other strong positive attitudes were toward school and unit inservice, unit aides, teaching small and medium groups, and central location of teaching materials).

In a few cases the negative attitude was fairly strong. Some 30% of teachers were not happy with the size of their unit's student body and 26% felt negative about the number of teachers. Whatever the numbers involved, a sizable proportion were not satisfied. In two other cases the "objection" was more specific: 43% preferred not to teach large groups (30 or more) and 25% felt negative about <u>all</u> teachers teaching all subject areas. From other sources we know that many teachers have preferred their own "special subjects" and felt uncomfortable in teaching all subject areas.

Two topics may be of special interest because of their basic importance in the MUSE structure. As to "departmentalization within the unit," 43% were favorable (perhaps reflecting the status quo to a considerable extent), 35% felt neutral, and 19% responded in the negative. And related to this, 32% felt positive about "having self-contained classrooms within the unit," with about equal proportions feeling neutral and negative. Quite clearly, a continuing effort is required in order to replace certain attitudes which are inimical to the MUSE/IGE designs.

Most items drew virtually identical percentages of unit leaders and staff teachers to the 3 ratings; however, for six topics there were differences between 8% and 14% on the positive rating and between 2% and 20% on the parallel negative reactions. The chart on the following page outlines these findings.

	Positive		Negative	
	Unit Ldr	Teacher	Unit Ldr	Teacher
Size of unit teaching staff	59%	50%	24%	26%
Teaching large groups (30+)	40%	26%	27%	47%
All teachers teaching all students	71%	59%	9%	16%
All teachers teaching all subjects	50%	40%	19%	26%
Multiaging students (2-3 year span)	67%	59%	6%	14%
Self-contained classrooms in unit	26%	35%	41%	33%

The data suggest that, to a small but perhaps meaningful degree, unit leaders as a group have more positive attitudes about teaching large groups, teaching all children and subjects in the unit, and multiaging. All four of these are recommended practices, and it is not surprising that unit leaders seem to be a little more in tune with the objectives. Similarly, unit leaders might be expected to prefer other arrangements than self-contained classrooms; and this is reflected in their smaller positive response percentage.

The differences should be examined also in terms of level of response. Thus it is noted that fewer than half the unit leaders felt positive about teaching large groups, and just half were favorable toward teaching all subject areas. The criteria which are viewed most positively by unit leaders are multiaging (67%) and teaching all unit students (71%).

In a number of these cases, the neutral rating takes on significance (see Table M-22) since as many as 25% of the total group of leaders and teachers did not express positive (or negative) convictions concerning several practices considered basic to MUSE and IGE.

Table M-23 reports responses to the question, "In general...which of the following proportions of time would be your personal preference for 'doing things as a unit?'" Just 15% indicated "all the time" and the largest proportion (34%) preferred "most of the time." The other 50% of the total group preferred half of the time or even less. The general attitude across 776 teachers is not highly favorable toward total operations as a unit-team, for whatever reasons. As Table M-23 also shows, unit leaders were more favorably disposed than staff teachers to working as a unit, with a total of 60% of them preferring all or most of the time. However, the numbers of unit leaders indicating "about half" and "some" suggest either some confusion about the leader's role or ambivalence about working with others. Two factors should be noted in interpreting the findings: a) the data reflect attitudes expressed at the end of the year, and b) the question was put in terms of "if you could arrange things."

Comparison with the previous attitudinal question (see discussion above) suggests that even though 87% felt positive about "making plans and decisions with others" and 68% were favorable to "having a resource person but all teachers teaching a subject"--they preferred these activities, in effect, on a parttime basis.

Table M-24 reports on a rating question concerned with how well the IIC carried out various tasks. (Note that the number of omits is quite large--from 80 (10%) to 189 (24%) of the total group; respondents were asked to omit activities which did not apply to their IIC's). Topics were drawn from implementation suggestions and thus were posed as desirable functions, but the number of omits itself suggests that some IIC's have not yet taken on certain of these. Moreover, as a group, the respondents were ambivalent in their ratings; in no case did a rating (poorly, adequately, well) draw over 50% of the total. The 'adequate" rating consistently received the largest response percentages; highest percentages in the "poorly" and "well" categories were between 20% and 25%.

Percentage differences are small, but the two functions perceived most frequently as being well-done were "improving staff communications" and "taking the place of the traditional teachers' meeting." The two tasks apparently done well the least frequently were "locating needed instructional materials" and "coordinating contacts with parents." Overall, about 20% of respondents indicated that each of the 8 listed tasks was done poorly. The function most frequently (24%) rated as done poorly was "coordinating the instructional program."

Unit leaders, of course, are IIC members and their responses are included. In 3 cases their tendency to rate the job well-done makes some difference in interpretation. With respect to "improving overall school communication," "coordinating use of space and materials," and "taking the place of the teachers' meeting," 15% more unit leaders rated these well-done than did staff teachers. At the same time, there were still from 10% to 14% of unit leaders who rated these as poorly-done.

Overall--in the estimation of the respondents--the IIC has considerable room for improvement in fulfilling a variety of MUSE/IGE functions. But that will not be easy to assess in any case, since even in the present population different teachers in the same school rated the IIC activities very differently. It should be said, however, that all 8 tasks listed were

perceived by 75% or more of the respondents as being done either adequately or well.

The remainder of the items in the teacher instrument relate to certain "facts" about teaching assignments and contact with children. First, teachers were asked to describe their regular teaching activities (see Table M-25); these included self-contained classes and the teaching of various groups in either multiaged or single-aged groups. Close to half (46%) reported teaching various multiaged groups in the unit as their characteristic mode, and the remainder reported as follows: 26% teaching various single-age single-grade groups in the unit; 12% teaching a particular (self-contained) multiaged group; 8% teaching a self-contained single-age group. The most frequent mode, therefore, was the one closest to the MUSE/IGE specifications. (The question was not asked in terms of only the IGE subject(s); we trust that the data in fact do report the characteristic modes through the school day and all subject-areas). A total of 53 teachers indicated other modes, most frequently a combination of multiage and single-age groups. As to teacher-unit leader differences, percentage variations never exceeded 6%.

Second, as shown in Table M-26, teachers engaged in a wide variety of special assignments within units. The most frequent task (20% of teachers) was to serve as resource person for periods of time for a given subject, followed by 19% serving as permanent resource persons for a given subject, and 19% developing or gathering instructional materials. The other activities involved from 1% to 11% of the total group. It is noted that a large number of teachers indicated as many as 5 such assignments while many colleagues in the same units reported none. Leaders and teachers shared all assignments.

Third, in connection with activities related to the whole school, 46 teachers (or 6%) stated that they planned and/or taught a subject in more than one unit; proportions were virtually the same for unit leaders and staff teachers. As to having some other schoolwide specialty or task, 109 teachers responded as indicated below. No activity was checked by more than 5% of the total group, and most reported tasks not directly related to MUSE/IGE.

Subject-area resource person or committee member.....35
League or district representative for the school.....14
School club activity..... 6
Committee on objectives for IGE subject-area..... 7
Coordinator, substitute principal, counselor.....12
Resource person for special subject (music, art)..... 7
Director for materials, resources, A-V equipment..... 9
Other (such things as character committee, safety patrol, goodwill group, PTA office).....19

Fourth, extent of contact with unit pupils was asked about. Teachers reported the proportion of unit students they had regularly scheduled instructional contact with. The findings showed that--regardless of unit size or number of teachers involved--25 teachers (or 3%) had regular touch with as few as 10-19% of unit students, while 185 teachers (or 24%) regularly taught from 90% to 100% of the pupils. Every 10% interval was represented, revealing that one fourth of the teachers had regular contact with 49% or fewer of "their" unit students. (In each interval, percentages for unit leaders and staff teachers were virtually the same). These "student-contact" data are reported below.

	Percentage Range								
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-100
Number of Teachers	25	82	55	35	132	50	118	61	185
% of Teachers	3	11	7	5	17	6	15	8	24

Fifth, teachers were asked about a particular group of unit students who were "theirs" for reporting, guidance, or other purposes. Some 77, or 10%, reported having no such group; among the remaining 90% of teachers, the most frequent group size was 21 to 30, though there were some smaller groups and others as large as 70 children. As to the reasons for such groups, these are outlined in the chart below. (Many teachers checked more than one function). Percentage differences between leaders and staff teachers never exceeded 4%.

Purpose of Group	Number of Teachers	% of Teachers
Homeroom group	513	66
Parent contact (reports, conferences)	319	41
Guidance; monitor school progress	114	15
Particular group taught daily	274	35
Self-contained class taught daily	144	19

Automatic homeroom groupings are the most popular basis for such regular contact. Within units, however, many teachers apparently take on responsibility for certain defined groups of students vis-a-vis parent contact or general monitoring and guidance. In addition, a large number of teachers reported this sort of "mother-hen" relationship with particular groups they teach daily.

The Teaching Unit

Each unit was asked--as a unit--to provide information about its meetings, inservice, and instructional procedures. Complete returns were received from 208 units representing 59 schools; the number of responding units varied from 1 to 9 per school. Typically 75% of units submitted returns, but in several cases all units responded.

Several questions were asked concerning unit meetings. As detailed in the chart below, the great majority of units reported having a prepared agenda, but an equivalent majority did not keep minutes for these meetings. A majority (58%) also reported that aides and student teachers do not regularly attend the unit meetings, although some indicated occasional attendance (via footnotes). As to the principal's attendance, about equal proportions (38%) noted his "rare" and "occasional" attendance; in a few instances it was "often," and in a larger number it was "never."

	YES		NO	
	N	%	N	%
Almost always have a prepared agenda?	146	70	58	28
Minutes recorded and distributed to staff?	51	25	154	74
Aides (& student teachers) regularly attend?	86	43	117	57
Does principal attend unit meetings at times?	177	85	27	13

Principal's Attendance

Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Always
27 -13%	80 -38%	79 -38%	15 -7%	3 - 1%

With respect to unit inservice, 117 (or 56%) made a positive response. (Of the 91 No responders, 37 indicated an intent to institute such inservice next year and 52 had no such plans). Among the 117 units, the great majority noted use of IGE training materials, emphasis on the individualized curriculum, and study of unit operations along with learning/teaching styles. Virtually all units reported that the inservice was viewed as beneficial and indicated plans to continue next year. These data are reported in Table M-27 using 117 as the total N.

Units were also asked about the current IGE subject(s). Of 208 units, 183 (or 88%) reported having an IGE subject-area in May; 21 (10%) reported having none, and there were 4 omits. In addition, 54 units noted a second IGE subject. For both subjects, a large majority--but not all-- of the units

practiced certain aspects of the programing model: assessing in terms of behavioral objectives, grouping in terms of common needs, regrouping as students progressed, and having all unit teachers teach the IGE subject. Table M-28 outlines these findings, and also reports on various teaching arrangements; the majority of units taught groups of changing composition and size based on periodic regrouping. Thus it can be seen that of the units teaching an IGE subject, most reported that they were engaging in the prescribed instructional practices.

Finally, units checked the various ways in which the IIC had been of assistance (in the instructional domain) during the year. Of six options, by far the most frequently noted (by 58% of the units) was help in working out scheduling problems. Other areas related to consultants, records systems, behavioral objectives, instructional plans, and, least often, criterion-referenced tests (see Table M-29). Given that these are areas where the IIC should direct and assist, it would appear that either units did not call on the IIC or the IIC's were not yet prepared to provide such help. This was the first operational year for most IIC's, of course, as well as for virtually all the units.

With respect to the sample of 208 units (in 59 schools), in most areas a large majority adhered to the same general practices: preparing meeting agendas, having principal attend at times, conducting unit inservice, using the IGE training materials, functioning along instructional propraming lines with one IGE subject, and having all unit teachers involved in that subject. On the other hand, fewer than half kept formal meeting records or included aides/student teachers in the meetings; and a number reported that they did not teach the IGE subject according to all aspects of the model. Some 54 units had taken on a second IGE subject, and most of these were able to report following the model's intent in both subject-areas.

In addition, variations within schools were observed on many topics, to the extent that the unit appeared to be a fairly independent entity. For example, different units began their formal meetings--in the same school--several months apart in a number of schools. As to weekly formal meetings, they varied as much as 3 hours in length in many schools. Some units prepared meeting agendas and others did not. Some kept formal minutes while others did not. In the same schools, one or two units reported having no

aides where other units had them. In schools where all units had aides, some regularly included these paraprofessionals in the unit meetings and others did not. Certain units conducted their own inservice training while other units down the hall made no such provisions. Similarly, some units in a school had programs for unit parents, while others had not as yet done this. And in-school differences obtained in the principal's attendance at unit meetings; one unit reported his frequent attendance, another his rare participation, and another his complete absence. These variations--and others related to instructional practices--were the rule, not the exception. And, given different unit leaders and different unit members, such variations may not be surprising. Their frequency, however, defines a pervasive lack of uniformity in the way unit operations were conducted within as well as across MUSE/IGE schools.

The Instructional Improvement Committee

Responses were received from the IIC's of 52 schools. One school had not had an IIC earlier but by May it was meeting irregularly with the IIC of another school (not in the sample). In another case, the principal noted that the IIC had not yet been organized (as of May).

IIC's were set up, and began functioning, at quite different times, varying as much as 5 months among the schools which "installed" in September 1971. This is especially noted because all IIC's treated in this section reported their activities, problems, and status as of May 1972--yet they had had different histories and initiation dates, aside from the factor of fall and spring semesters installation. As shown in Table M-30, a few IIC's began functioning as the school's governing group as early as March or April 1971, while others became active after September. Similarly with the spring-installing group: IIC's were set up as early as September 1971, and began functioning anywhere between October 1971 and March 1972.

At year's end, IIC regular meetings varied from ½ hour per week (in 4 schools) to more than 3 hours (2 schools), and one did not meet regularly. The great majority had formal meetings of 1 to 1½ hours.

As to agendas and minutes, and attendance and evaluation of IIC meetings, the chart below summarizes the responses across the 52 schools.

	N	%
Agenda regularly prepared	41	79
Agenda printed in advance of meeting	36	69
IIC keeps log or formal minutes	29	56
Minutes (or reports) are distributed in school	32	62
Staff teachers receive minutes	20	38
Unit leaders receive minutes	27	52
Non-IIC members sometimes invited	31	60
IIC evaluates minutes and/or functions	26	50
Principal is chairman of IIC	50	96

Except for the principal's serving as chairman and the regular preparation of an agenda, the statements above do not characterize the IIC's in this sample. For example, many have agendas but not minutes, several schools do not distribute minutes even to the unit leaders, and self-evaluation of any sort is apparently a practice in just half the IIC's.

IIC's were asked to report which broad activities they had engaged in through the year. As shown below, the majority took on most of the 6 listed functions, with parent-contact and schoolwide inservice being the areas attended to by the smallest numbers. All but one school indicated monitoring IGE implementation as one of its functions.

	N	%
Monitor IGE implementation and evaluate progress	51	98
Deal with, explain to, get support of parents	41	79
Aid units re IGE subject, materials, records	45	87
Plan and arrange schoolwide inservice training	43	83
Manage school and deal with personnel relations	48	92
Plan for MUSE/IGE operations in 1972-73	48	92

However, great variation was found in terms of percentages of time involved. Three IIC's reported even time distribution and another 14 had given roughly equal amounts to the 6 functions. The remaining 35 emphasized one function (anywhere from 40% to 75% of reported IIC time) as outlined below.

Function	Number of IIC's Reporting 40-75% Time
Monitor IGE implementation, evaluate	7
Aid units re IGE subject, materials	8
Plan and arrange school inservice	1
Manage school; personnel relations	16
Plan for 1972-73 MUSE/IGE operations	3

All things considered, the majority of IIC's were concerned with a broad spectrum of functions to some degree; based on time percentages, however,

well over half the schools concentrated on one function to the deemphasis of others. About one-third emphasized "general school management and personnel relations" whereas only one-seventh concentrated on monitoring IGE implementation.

Two IIC functions in particular were examined in another way: (a) Monitoring the IGE implementation was dealt with an average of 18% of the time, with a range from None to 70% across all schools and (b) Planning and arranging schoolwide inservice took an average of 8% of IIC time, with a range from None to 50%. For these two categories, obviously the percentage entries were typically quite small.

Table M-31 outlines the implementation problems noted on a checklist of possibilities. The first column reports conditions which were considered "nettlesome, presenting troublesome obstacles to smooth implementation." It reveals that the only obstacles checked by the great majority (87%) and (79%) were time available for unit planning and time for inservice training. Seven other problem areas were indicated by just over half the IIC's:

Keeping records and recording student progress
Assessment of children's status and needs
Overall school and separate unit schedules
Discipline, noise, confusion
Nature of the building (layout, rooms, doors)
Supply of variety of teaching materials
Scheduling special teachers into unit programs

It is apparent that the more or less mechanical matters of available time, schedules, and the building were of considerable concern, along with materials, "discipline," and instructional assessment. All 28 items were checked at least 10 times (19%) and this gives a fair picture of both the range and intensity of problems schools might encounter. The average was 12 items.

But respondents were also asked to check the four most serious problems they faced, as reported in Table M-31. With the exception of "time available for unit planning," noted by 62% of the IIC's, the obstacles were checked in a fairly uniform way by an average of 15% of the respondents. Every item but one was indicated as a "most serious" problem, somewhere. In those cases noted only once or twice it is likely that quite local conditions were operative. But four items were marked by more than 20% of the schools, and these might be considered of special importance; three of these had been mentioned as frequent obstacles in the discussion above.

Time available for unit planning
Assessment of children's status and needs
Nature of the building
Implementing the IGE instructional programing model

The encouraging side is that IIC's also reported success in coping with a number of these problems (see Table M-31 again). For example, about half the schools which reported unit planning time as a serious obstacle also reported dealing with the problem and making significant progress. And 17 of the 19 schools reporting multiaged grouping to be troublesome also indicated successful coping. Every problem area was dealt with successfully, as reported, by anywhere from 10% to 44% of the schools. There is no information describing the attempts to cope, but we know from other sources that in some cases actual decisions and resolutions were achieved and in other cases progress resulted when resistance broke down or other adjustments were made.

Several questions concerned the use of a variety of resources. Some 41 schools (79%) reported utilization of implementation guides; those published by I/D/E/A and the Wisconsin R & D Center were both frequently indicated. As detailed below, 73% of the IIC's employed the guide(s) as a reference book, but much less frequently as a means of evaluation or keeping track of progress. It is quite apparent that detailed and systematic use of the guides did not become a pattern; and equally apparent that not all schools employed the guides for any purpose.

	N	%
Reference source, implementation aid for ideas	38	73
Checklist for completed activities	16	31
Record of projected dates, dates of accomplishment, means used, future plans	10	19
As a way of assessing status and progress	19	37

Table M-32 shows the value attached to the guides by the 41 IIC's. With respect to both long-range usefulness and first-year guidance, over half the users rated them "good;" there were several "excellent" and "moderate" ratings as well as 2 or 3 at the "fair" level.

All 52 schools reported having schoolwide inservice training during the year. Scheduled time varied from fewer than 5 hours to more than 21, with the highest frequency at over 21 hours (22 schools, or 42%). Two categories--unit leaders and staff teachers--were typically present at inservice sessions in all schools, and 49 of the 52 principals regularly attended. In 23 schools aides participated, in 31 schools the librarian/IMC director was involved on most occasions, and the same was true for interns and student teachers in 21 schools. Allowing that a few schools did not

have personnel in these latter 3 categories, it still appears that in close to half the locations inservice was either not intended for or not required of these persons.

For purposes of feedback, IIC's were asked to what extent the IGE films, filmstrips, and/or booklets were employed in inservice programs for the staff after beginning MUSE/IGE installation. Frequencies are indicated below.

Often	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
6 - 12%	9 - 17%	31 -60%	3 - 6%	3 - 6%

Respondents defined other opportunities for training or mutual support which were made use of during the year. A majority of schools indicated participation in school visits, linkage-sponsored activities, informal local meetings, and training activities which featured special consultants, as follows:

	N	%
Visits to other MUSE/IGE schools	40	77
Local or regional meetings of 2 or more staffs	34	65
Inservice featuring consultant from the State Department of Education	32	62
Inservice featuring consultant from I/D/E/A or Wisconsin R & D Center	27	52
Training activities sponsored by League or Pact	46	88

Among the 46 schools reporting linkage-sponsored activities, the great share of participation was by principals (46 schools or 88%) and unit leaders (43 schools or 83%). Staff teachers from 18 schools (35%) were involved, as were aides and librarians from 8 schools (15%).

Table M-33 reports IIC ratings of a wide spectrum of training resources. Many items (such as consultants from the District office) were expected not to apply to certain schools because of lack of availability; figures for this circumstance are provided along with the separate ratings. Overall, with respect to print and film materials as well as persons and groups, the IIC's rated their resources as "good," although there were also "excellent" ratings in all but one category and "poor" ratings for all but 4 items. One observation: Nearly every item is rated at each scale-point, which speaks for both the perceiver and the perceived across these schools. Only one item was not rated "fair" or "poor" (the R & D Center "Resource File" which became available at midyear) and thus its general usefulness is attested; however, 31 schools reported "does not apply" which indicates that the File was unknown or unavailable to many school staffs.

Just under half (25 or 48%) of the IIC's reported that they had developed an overall MUSE/IGE implementation timetable for the first year. However, of the 27 No's to that question, 18 stated plans to develop such a guide for next school year.

* * * * *

Two major questions were asked regarding policy matters: decision-making and stated goals. Table M-34 reports individuals and groups involved in a variety of decisions, showing the general directions which decentralization of authority had taken by year's end. For each of 16 topics, respondents checked principal, IIC, unit leader, unit, or other--or any combination of these. Thus joint decisions were reported and it was not possible to pinpoint specific locuses of decision-making; interpretation must be based on relative frequencies involved since untold combinations were entered. (Among the 52 schools, total number of entries per item varied from 63 to 102 across all categories).

One thing is obvious right off. In no case did the number of principals exceed 42 (of 52 principals)...and except for that one case (makeup of unit teaching staff), all other decisions involved 33 principals at the most (or 63%). Principals appeared much involved in decisions about a) selection of aides, b) communications with parents, c) schoolwide inservice, d) staff training away from school, and e) even selection of materials for the IMC... but very few principals were involved in decisions concerning a) unit inservice, b) record forms, c) unit schedules, d) students' use of extra-classroom space, and e) even what subjects given teachers would teach. In this latter group of decisions, the units played a major role.

On the other hand, there was only one decision where a high proportion of unit leaders was involved (deciding agendas of unit meetings, in 47 schools -- 90%)...but even there units were included in 32 schools (or 62%). Apparently, unit leaders as a rule made few direct decisions, but rather acted in concert with the unit staffs.

The IIC did not appear to participate in many major decisions; in the 3 areas where more than 40% of IIC's were involved, either the principal or the units were also participants. It is likely that IIC "decisions" often amounted to referring the matter to the units for resolution.

The data appear to justify the inference that indeed decision-making was extended beyond the school office on the whole. And it most frequently came to reside at the unit level--although a few decisions rested with unit leaders or the IIC. (District influence was felt in several areas, notably hiring, communications with public and parents, and inservice training, areas where District policy had no doubt been in effect for a long time). The table does not show the frequency of individual school patterns; these included many instances where nearly every decision was shared by 3 or 4 categories--and a number of cases where only 1 person or group was reported to have made the decisions in the school.

The second question dealt with goals and expectations which might be considered formal or informal policy. For sixteen topics listed--all related to unit and IIC functions, and all drawn from the implementation criteria--the response range was 16 to 45 schools (31% to 87%), with an average of 35 schools (67%). Thus, on the whole, a moderate majority of IIC's checked the statements as representing goals and policies for their schools (see Table M-35). The range of statements checked as goals was 2 to 16; greatest frequency was at 12 and 13 items, with an average of 11.

The topics least frequently checked (below the 50% level) included three IIC activities in connection with reviewing unit plans and meetings, and the teacher's specializing in working with certain group sizes. Topics reported as goals by more than 80% of schools included all teachers working with IGE subject, a variety of instructional groupings, student having a "home" teacher, and prescribed unit meeting schedules.

No particular patterns emerged, but perhaps two statements can be made. First, a number of important MUSE/IGE aspects had not yet been adopted as goals by all schools, and of course other sources indicate that some of these practices were by no means universal. Second, however, data were gathered at the end of the initial implementation year, and the relatively high percentages on many topics may be interpreted as awareness of the various requirements. Moreover, many schools indicated that either the criteria were currently operative or that they had made fairly concrete plans for the 1972-73 school year.

* * * * * *

The final question was intended as a summary statement of status with respect to twelve major implementation areas. Chapter II outlined the selection of these topics, explaining the inclusion of four criteria named by the R & D Center staff and the addition of eight others based on implementation guides and direct field experience. Each of the twelve areas was broken down into 2 or 3 subtopics (for a total of 26 specific questions) in order to give more basis for interpretation. The twelve topics were asked about in this order:

1. School has an active IIC
2. The library/IMC is well-stocked and well-used
3. School has differentiated staff functions
4. Communications within the school are open
5. Students are multiaged within units
6. Principal is an effective leader and catalyst
7. School follows instructional programing model in one subject
8. Teamwork works in the units
9. School is fully unitized
10. There is effective unit leadership
11. The level of commitment by teachers is high
12. School makes use of many resources in fostering MUSE/IGE

Responses to the 26 specific questions are outlined in Table M-36. On a cautious assumption that each item "should" have been answered in the positive, it is apparent that none of them was. Three items (each in a different area) drew 50 (or 96%) Yes responses, and three others (in two other areas) drew fewer than 50% of the responses. The range was 37% to 96% Yes, with most falling between 75% and 95%. In terms of the number of positive and negative responses from individual schools, the positives ranged from 8 per school to 25 (with an average of 21), and the negatives from 1 per school to 17 (with an average of 4.5). By either sort of calculation, it can be seen that schools reported falling short of a uniform implementation so far as these particular questions are concerned.

The four most basic criterion areas fared fairly well. Some 90% of schools reported an "active IIC" in terms of regular meetings and IIC instructional decisions. (This is a little puzzling, however, since 98% reported regular IIC meetings in response to an earlier question in the same instrument).

As to multiaging, 88% reported that units were multiaged, and 81% that instruction itself was typically directed to multiage groups. (Since many

of these schools were on the visit roster, it must be concluded that multi-aged instruction here refers only to the special IGE subject(s) and not to typical instruction in all curriculum areas).

Regarding the IGE subject, 92% indicated having at least one, and 83% reported its being implemented in all the school's units. But the IGE instructional programing model presented a problem: 31 schools, or 60%, noted that the model was being followed in all units with the IGE subject. (These data closely match the findings from visits and other detailed instruments).

Fewer than 80% of schools reported being fully unitized, that is, with all regular staff teachers and students organized into units. And just under 50% reported that the kindergarten was instructionally integrated into a primary unit. (Full unitization is not the rule; however, this area is confounded by definition problems and the fact that some schools have no kindergarten. Based on all sources, it seems likely that the 80% level of "full unitization" is accurate).

As Table M-36 shows, the other eight areas present quite a range of implementation status. For example, the IMC comes out on the bottom, so to speak, with 37% and 44% Yes responses to questions concerning its stock of materials and its utilization as a resource. Two other areas are uniformly on the high side: a) school communications (percentages above 94% on two direct questions), and b) unit teamwork and satisfaction (percentages above 92% on two questions).

The remainder may be termed "medium" or "mixed." Two questions related inferentially to the principal's leadership (see items 6a and 6b) drew Yes responses from 77% and 88% of schools; the same is roughly true for leadership apparently exhibited by unit leaders, with 67% and 81% Yes responses. It is noteworthy that IIC's indicated unit leader difficulty in "encouraging or assigning a variety of teaching responsibilities" (27% responding No to that question). Teacher commitment--to the multiunit scheme and individualized education--was reported by 81% and 87% of the IIC's.

As to differentiated staffing, 94% reported contributions being made by aides, but only 73% indicated that teachers took on different roles within the units. Another area concerned use of resources in fostering MUSE/IGE: 75% reported regular schoolwide inservice, 88% called on consultants or other resources, and 96% noted staff attendance at training activities outside the school itself.

All things considered, the sample of 52 IIC's turned in a generally encouraging report of year-end implementation status in most of the twelve areas. Exceptions have been noted (functioning of the IMC/Library, non-unitized kindergartens, and partial adherence to the instructional programing model),--and similarly, the particular strengths across schools have been discussed. A very small number indicated uncertain or partial implementation, as noted in Table M-36 (and there were scattered omissions), but the majority provided direct Yes or No answers to the 26 fairly direct questions.

Items Common to All Individual Respondents

With the exception of district personnel, all individuals were asked to complete the same sets of attitudinal and rating items on what is called the "Common Response" page. The 902 respondents to this page were divided as follows:

Principals..... 55
Unit Leaders.....192
Staff Teachrs.....592
Librarians/IMC.... 39
IGE Specialists... 24

Four aspects of the benefits of "your overall training and exposure up to now (May 1972)" were inquired about, using a 5-point scale from Excellent to Poor. As to the value of training for preparing staff to take on their new roles, Table M-37 shows that sentiments were fairly evenly distributed (22% to 29%) among the ratings Good, Moderate, and Fair, with 8% of the total group indicating Excellent, and 14% responding Poor. A distinct hierarchy appears among principals, unit leaders, and staff teachers when the Moderate category is ignored. Combining Fair and Poor, 13% of principals responded, 32% of unit leaders, and 40% of teachers. (The converse applies when Good and Excellent are combined). Quite obviously, a large portion of the staff teachers as a group felt inadequately prepared for their unit roles, and many unit leaders had the same reaction; most principals had a positive reaction, on the other hand.

Table M-38 deals with the question of value of training for informing staff about multiunit structure, purposes, and operations. Larger proportions of each subgroup felt more positively about this matter, with a total

of 50% rating the training as Good or Excellent. The same pattern applied here (as above) with respect to principals, unit leaders, and staff teachers, except at a different (more favorable) level.

On the question of the value of training for informing staff of the IGE purposes and procedures, Table M-39 shows almost exactly the same reactions for the total group as for informing staff of MUSE operations; and the same relationships inhere for the three subgroups of interest. It appears that from the standpoint of information, there are two valid observations: (a) principals, unit leaders, and staff teachers felt decreasingly satisfied, in that order, and (b) general information was more successfully disseminated than was specific guidance on the actual roles to be pursued.

Table M-40 reports reactions to the general value of the school's in-service program. Here again, ratings of Excellent were provided by a very few (6%); similar percentages were reflected for Good, Moderate, and Fair; and 15% rated at the Poor level. Again, too, it was the staff teachers who indicated the least benefit from inservice training.

Similar ratings were requested concerning the "success" of the implementation in the first year. Table M-41 shows, with respect to the multiunit structure, that 44% of the total group felt this had been Good and another 13% indicated Excellent. Proportions in the Fair and Poor categories were 11% and 4% respectively. As a group, however, principals rated the "success" at a higher level than unit leaders and teachers (whose ratings this time were very similar). Proportionately, a good many more teachers saw and responded to weaknesses in the outcome than did principals. As Table M-42 reveals, virtually the same responses were made concerning the success of the IGE instructional model in one subject-area. The majority (58%) of the total group felt the outcome had been Good or Excellent, while 10% saw it as Fair or Poor.

An interesting observation, therefore, is that while considerably larger groups, at year's end, felt uncomfortable or insecure about their personal preparation (see Tables M-37 to M-40), when it came to rating the MUSE and IGE outcomes the majority indicated confidence and satisfaction. Looking at all these ratings in perspective, it is also clear that principals as a group reported the least dissatisfactions with both training and outcomes.

Respondents were asked to consider their actual training experience and indicate whether they would prefer to have had more opportunities of 5 specified sorts. As reported in Table M-43, on a Yes-No basis, the majority of the total group of each subgroup responded Yes to questions concerning a) training prior to implementation, b) training during implementation, c) contact with outside consultants, d) practical how-to-do-it training, and e) developing and discussing plans. This serves to reinforce other observations about the reactions of staff members to the amount and kind of training they had and the timing of it. Moreover, the outstanding wish expressed here (by an average of 88% of the subgroup respondents) was for more practical training. (Many replied Yes to training prior to implementation and No to training during, and of course a number replied in the converse; however, a large majority of respondents indicated Yes for both alternatives).

Of perhaps greater interest are the responses to three openended questions, as shown in Tables M-45, M-46, and M-47. In each case, the 30% of the topics which drew the most mentions are included in the tables. For example, the first question was, "If you could set up a workshop of your own devising right now, what would its topics and purpose be?" In all, 37 response topics were coded, some of course having been mentioned by only 2 or 3 persons. Of these 37 topics, the top 30%, or 11 items, were isolated for analysis (and represent the workshop topics of 62% of the total response group).

As shown in Table M-45, the overwhelming concern of the total group was with IGE instructional programing: planning for a given subject, unit management, general IGE review, practice with IGE, assessment, records, grouping, and objectives. Most notable is the apparent need for a total implementation plan for a given IGE subject-area, but equally striking is the concern by 7% of the total group (in all staff categories) for a review and overview of IGE purposes, methods, and materials. In addition, frequent workshop topics included the following:

-total intra-staff communication for the school
-setting up good school and/or unit media centers
-how to work as a team: share, teach, plan, get along
-(Other)...learning modes, aides, kindergarten in a unit

Table M-46 relates to the second openended question, "If there are weaknesses in the whole training design, what one weakness stands out in your mind?" Many responses dealt with implementation problems and were discounted; there were 35 topics coded, and the top 30%, or 11 items, were isolated for analysis (representing about 40% of the total response group). Major weaknesses noted were lack of practical training, too little and too late training, lack of problem-solving approach, and inadequate training for staff teachers. Two interesting aspects of training were also noted: the lack of inclusion in the training of (a) planning experiences and (b) study and use of materials/resources for an IGE subject-area. As might be expected, all of these concerns reflect sentiments noted in other instruments and in school visits.

Table M-47 reports responses to the question, "If you were going to advise a school going MUSE/IGE next year, what would be your single most important piece of advice?" There were 46 topics coded, and the top 30%, or 13 items, were analyzed (representing about 60% of the total group). Responses fell into four groupings (with an "Other" category which included 7 recommendations "not to do it."). (1) MUSE: be sure to have compatible teams; and adequate time for planning. (2) IGE: have adequate materials; and try only one IGE subject-area. (3) Approach: go slow; expect to work hard; be flexible. (4) Prior steps: be sure staff has a choice; be sure of staff commitment; be sure staff understands concepts and requirements; and insist on much prior training, planning, and preparation of all sorts. The most frequent pieces of advice (noted by 8% and 7% respectively) were "go slow" and "form compatible teams."

There are predictable relationships among the three questions: workshop topic, training weaknesses, and advice to "new" schools. The concerns of staff members emerge (and are related to other data sources) and overall appear to be:

-understanding and following the IGE instructional model
-practical experience and training in many MUSE/IGE elements
-amount and timing of training
-amount and kind of advance preparation
-interpersonal relationships
-materials and resources needed
-formation of unit teams

It may also be noted that across all three questions, staff teachers and unit leaders expressed their concern in every topic reported here.

Principals joined them in many of these topics, and the librarians and IGE specialists shared some concerns.

* * * * * *

A final question was asked of all respondents concerning their personal feelings about MUSE and IGE, at both the beginning and end of the school year. Four scale points were presented: Cautious, Neutral, Agreeable, and Enthusiastic. The data will be reported in several ways, since this would seem to be a fairly important matter, reflecting year-end overall attitudes.

First, the end-point attitudes of the total response group were clearly toward the positive for both MUSE and IGE. The chart below shows that for both innovations over 75% indicated either Agreeable or Enthusiastic, with 18-19% reporting Cautious or Neutral feelings. As noted elsewhere in the report, there seem to be several indications that even though staff members have had a difficult year, have lodged various concerns and complaints, and have followed the models to only partial degrees...still the general reaction and attitude has been favorable.

Year-end Attitudes of Total Group

	OMIT		CAUTIOUS		NEUTRAL		AGREEABLE		ENTHUSIASTIC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MUSE	64	-7	68	- 8	97	-11	328	-36	345	-38
IGE	21	-2	89	-10	72	- 8	295	-33	425	-47

It is also noted that the Enthusiastic category holds the largest percentages of the total group--and that there is a tendency for IGE to be perceived more favorably than MUSE.

Changes in attitude were also noted, and were found to be very similar for the MUSE and IGE patterns. For example, 24% indicated Caution as their predominant feeling toward MUSE in the fall, and 22% toward IGE. As noted, the Cautious category drew 8% and 10% at year's end, for MUSE and IGE. Similarly, large increases were noted in the September-May responses, for both MUSE and IGE, in the Enthusiastic category. A further analysis revealed that the direction of change was essentially to the positive; 41% of the total sample moved in the positive direction (for both patterns),

and just about 10% moved to the negative. For MUSE and IGE respectively, 42% and 45% held to the same attitude whatever it was.

Finally, an attempt was made to relate the year-end feelings about the two patterns. Table M-48, below, shows various relationships for each subgroup and the total group. The bulk of the total response group felt either (a) enthusiastic about both patterns, (b) enthusiastic about one pattern, or (c) neutral and/or agreeable about both patterns. A total of 10% reported caution regarding one or both patterns...and 1% (or 5 persons) indicated real ambivalence: a cautious feeling about one innovation and an enthusiastic feeling about the other.

Table M-48

Year-end Attitudes Toward MUSE and IGE (combined)

	Both Enthus	Both Cautious	One Enthus	One Cautious	One Enthus & one Cautious	Neutral and/or Agreeable
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Principals	33 -60		13 -24	1 - 2		8 -15
Unit Leaders	82 -43	5 - 3	38 -20	6 - 3	1 - 1	53 -28
Staff Tchrs	157 -27	47 - 8	106 -18	32 - 5	4 - 1	236 -40
Librar/IMC	17 -44	2 - 5	4 -10			13 -33
IGE Special.	12 -50	1 - 4	5 -21			6 -25
TOTAL GROUP	301 -33	55 - 6	166 -19	39 - 4	5 - 1	316 -35

A clear hierarchy (from principal to unit leader to staff teacher) may again be seen, in the columns indicating "both enthusiastic" and "one enthusiastic." Principals are the most enthused group and presumably the guiding lights in effecting change, while staff teachers who feel the least informed and trained also apparently feel the least enthused. Even so, the proportions of those reporting year-end Caution were considerably reduced from the ratios at the beginning of the school year. The net result across all groups, and for both MUSE and IGE, is a favorable and responsive approach if not an enthusiastic adoption of the innovative patterns.

CHAPTER VI

SITE VISITS TO MULTIUNIT/IGE SCHOOLS

Introduction

Two fundamental purposes underlay site visits during the 1971-72 school year. First, as a part of the accounting process, it was intended to use visits as a means of verifying information obtained from questionnaire responses. While this is defensible with respect to the schools visited, it would hardly be appropriate to generalize to those which were not on the visit schedule. However, enough discrepancies between questionnaire and visit data were observed to suggest that in the total sample of schools the same conditions might obtain; at least one would read some of the questionnaire data cautiously. By the same token, visits revealed many unique situations and methods of solving problems, and their occurrence also suggests that similar conditions might obtain in the total sample.

Certainly the visits did make the implementation process come alive in each of the eight states included on the schedule. More than that, they revealed a wide spectrum of activities, problems, needs, purposes, conceptual frameworks, and interpretations. It is safe to imagine--based both on visit reports and some gratuitous questionnaire commentary--that even what might be regarded as the basic initial steps in implementation were handled in widely varying ways across the whole range of schools involved this year in the nationwide installation.

The second purpose was to track the implementation activities of a small number of schools in order to study the dynamics involved. This includes such matters as earlier plans later fulfilled, changes in attitude over time, means of selecting unit leaders and those in other roles, closer approximation to the instructional programing model, training opportunities taken advantage of, problems encountered and coped with, public relations efforts, and impacts on school practice and other areas of concern. This purpose was fulfilled by means of a series of visits to given schools and the resulting "case studies" of implementation strategy, which follow later in this report. It goes without saying that data and impressions gathered during visits in most cases went considerably beyond what it was possible to obtain through questionnaire instruments alone.

Procedure

After initial rosters were obtained from state coordinators in August, 1971, a computer sort was employed to randomly select 3 schools per state for

visits. For states with January 1972 implementation, the same procedure was used in the winter. But absolute faithfulness to this method was not possible. For example, one school was chosen and visited, but discovered not to be involved in MUSE/IGE after all; when replacement was made, a school was selected which implemented in the second semester. In a couple of other cases it was necessary to strike a school which the coordinator felt would present undue difficulty for visit purposes. These unusual cases were few.

As implied above, coordinators were advised at once of the schools randomly selected. In some cases they preferred to make initial contact with principals for setting up visits, and in others arrangements were made directly. Each principal was contacted by phone, and then by confirming letter, outlining the purposes of the visit. A special effort was made to arrange dates that would allow a thorough look at the school on a normal instructional day.

Visitors were selected from among ETS staff in 3 regional offices; these persons had backgrounds in elementary school education and experience in such informal yet purposeful visits. Visitors met as a group for discussion and consensus on methods and purposes (in early October) prior to the first round of site visits. It was decided that visitors should rotate among sites in order to get fresh perceptions and avoid undue repetition in interviews. Background and explanatory materials were prepared for the cadre of visitors, and a report form was developed for completion after each visit was concluded. A separate record form was prepared for reporting schoolwide in-service training sessions attended.

No structured interviews were involved, although particular topics of concern were always to be covered. Interviews were always held with the principal, and where possible with unit leaders, teachers, librarian-media specialist, children, special-subject teachers, and also state, district, or university representatives if they were present. Materials and files (such as IIC agendas, curriculum plans, and parent information leaflets) were studied, and classes were observed in action. The visitor sat in on formal meetings, including the IIC, units, and in-service; schedules were arranged in an attempt always to include such meetings.

After each visit the report form was completed, a narrative report and critique was written, and these along with related materials were sent to the project director for study. Before subsequent visits, the new visitor received former reports as background material and particular questions for

specific follow-up. Instruments are contained in Appendix G.

Visit Schedule

While the original plan included 8 states, with each to be visited in the same way and at about the same time, it became evident that such a plan could not be followed. One state was a second-semester state against earlier predictions; another's rosters were not available at the outset; one school dropped out of the sample; a date was set with one school but then was canceled; some schools had formal in-service training, but certainly not all. With these and similar considerations in mind, Table V-1 may be studied for an overview of the schedule of completed visits in 1971-72.

Generally speaking, visit #1 occurred in October and November, visit #2 in February, and visit #3 in May and June. The initial plan called for selection of 24 schools (3 in each of 8 states), each to be visited in the fall. Then one school would be dropped and the remaining two visited again in winter and spring. This approach was deemed desirable since it would provide a wider base for using initial visits to aid in questionnaire construction, and it allowed some selectivity in choosing the schools to be continued in the sample.

Aside from visits during the typical school day, some trips were arranged to include school-wide in-service training, especially in the fall. In addition, 5 schools were visited in late August or early September during the scheduled Preschool Workshop. These workshops were attended for several reasons: one was to get baseline information on key case-study schools even though classes were not in session; another was to observe one link in the training chain at enough sites to get a sense of its potential and variations; a third was to begin as early as possible to get real-life input concerning MUSE and IGE as a basis for content in the later questionnaires.

In Table V-1, schools are listed in the left-hand column, by state. Where a Preschool Workshop was observed, this is indicated by the date and name of visitor. For visits 1, 2 and/or 3, dates and names are again provided to indicate completion of the task. Some schools had scheduled formal inservice training for all or part of the staff, particularly in the fall. Where it was possible to observe such a session, this is shown by reference to its length.

Table V-1

Summary of Site Visits Scheduled and Completed
For 25 MUSE/IGE Schools during 1971-1972

	SCHOOL	Preschool Workshop	Visit # 1	In-service	Visit # 2	Visit #3	In-service	
+	EDISON	Sept. 1-2 Ironside	11/10 Ironside	11/10 1 hr.	2/16 Wagenknecht	5/17 Harvey		WISCONSIN
+	LINCOLN		11/9 Ironside		2/17 Wagenknecht	5/16 Harvey		
	DOWNSVILLE		11/8 Anderson					
+	JUCHEM	Sept. 1-2 Harvey	10/7 Harvey		2/10 Anderson	5/24 Ironside		COLORADO
	ARLINGTON		10/6 Harvey		2/9 Anderson			
+	RIVERVIEW		10/21 Ironside			5/23 Ironside		
+	METACOMET	Aug. 26 Reiss	10/28 Reiss	10/29 4 hrs.	2/7 Patterson	5/18 Reiss		CONN.
+	UNION		10/28 Harris	10/29 4 hrs.	2/8 Patterson	5/17 Reiss		
	WOODLAND		10/27 Harris	10/29 4 hrs.				
+	BIRCH LAKE	Sept. 2-3 Patterson	11/10 Patterson	11/11 1 day	2/15 Harvey	5/23 Anderson		MINN.
	MADISON		11/16 Anderson	11/15 1 day	2/14 Harvey	5/22 Anderson		
	READING		11/18 Anderson	11/17 ½ day				
+	NELSON	Aug. 26-27 Ironside	10/13 Hoeg, Richardson		1/27 Ironside	5/12 Patterson		SOUTH CAROLINA
+	BERKELEY		*		1/28 Ironside	5/11 Hoeg, Patterson		
	LEWISVILLE		10/26 Hoeg	10/27 2 hrs.				
+	COX		11/18 Ironside	11/18 1 hr.	2/10 Harvey	5/16 Wagenknecht		C.I.O
+	WASHINGTON		11/10 Harris	11/10 1 hr.	2/15 Anderson	5/11 Ironside	5/11 1 hr.	
	WALBRIDGE #		B		2/16 Anderson	*		
+	ZAHNOW		n		2/2 Ironside	5/17 Wagenknecht		ILLINOIS
	BUTTERWORTH		B		B-2	4/6 Ironside		
+	UNION RIDGE		n		2/1 Harvey	5/25 Ironside		
	CENTRAL		n		2/3 Ironside @			
+	WILKENS		B		B-2	6/6 Ironside		NEW JERSEY
+	SCOTT		B		B-2	6/5 Ironside		
	WILSON		B		B-2	6/8 Harris &		

& School barely involved in MUSE/IGE; plans fall 1972 implementation
* Visit dates set but schools forced to cancel at last minute
@ School is not involved in MUSE/IGE
# Chosen later to replace school not involved in MUSE/IGE
B Schools reported to be installing in second semester; no visit #1
B-2 Schools in later installation schedule; no visit #1 or #2
+ Indicates case-study schools
n Rosters not ready for school selection until after visit #1

Table V-1 shows that 10 schools were visited three times during the year, five were visited twice, and 10 visited once. The total of 25 schools includes the 24 (3 per state) originally intended and one "error visit". In addition to these 50 visits during the school day, there were observations at five Preschool Workshops and 10 in-service sessions. In toto, some schools were visited considerably more frequently than others; this was partly by design and partly by accident.

In addition to the set of formal visits, there were a few incidental ones not included in the plan. These occurred when the project staff were in pursuit of other goals and where either the activity took place at such a school or where a host offered an additional opportunity to observe a MUSE/IGE school in operation. In most cases these visits afforded useful information or perceptions. Table V-2 lists the several miscellaneous visits.

TABLE V-2

Incidental School Visits during 1971-72 school year

School	Date	Purpose of Trip
Riffenburg (Colo.)	9/3	Visit at outset of school's second year
Rock Ledge (Wisc.)	9/3	Visit at outset of school's second year
Morgan (Wisc.)	9/3	Visit at outset of school's second year
Seven Oaks (S.C.)	9/21	Observe a League activity
Caughman Road (S.C.)	9/21	Observe a League activity
Goodnight (Colo.)	10/22	Attend League principals' meeting
Jefferson (Wisc.)	11/9	Scheduled visit to a project school
Southview (Minn.)	11/10	Scheduled visit to a project school
Seven Oaks (S.C.)	11/11	Attend League inservice session
Central (Ill.)	2/3	Scheduled visit to this school

The Visit Atmosphere

One would expect considerable variation in the school atmospheres encountered and the substantive values of the visits. On the whole, however, it is safe to say that visitors were welcomed and given the keys to the school. Typically, the interview with the principal occurred first and lasted between one and two hours. Many principals then toured the building and introduced the visitor around, but in many cases (even on first visits) the outsider was invited to find his way, knock on doors, go to unit meetings, and otherwise fulfill the visit purposes. Both approaches were appreciated. There were of course a few instances where the principal and some

staff members appeared cautious, so to speak, or perhaps somewhat threatened; the school was "unprepared" for such visit. But generally the welcome mat was out and the door was open to candid discussion and open observation.

Accompanying this free-floating and informal atmosphere, there was in most schools an attitude of "help-us-out" or "let-me-tell-you-about." This means that rich material was gathered in the one-day visits, and that staff members were likely to discuss their dissatisfactions and problems as well as their new-found roles and levels of progress in IGE and MUSE. Where there was little to ask or report, school people had little to say. But where there were problems admitted, opportunities recognized, enthusiasm shared, or individualized education valued, there was much interaction with the visitor. Thus in only a few cases was the outsider viewed as a critical "school inspector." Very often, in unit meetings or in the school office, the visitor was perceived as a consultant on all matters; hardly his role, and yet he could hardly avoid being at least a sounding board. In some schools the IIC or principal requested an end-of-day assessment of progress and various kinds of feedback; again, this was not our role, but we reacted in terms of what we knew of other situations or--in later visits--what apparently was becoming common practice.

Visitors had intended to be as objective as possible, and perhaps a little distant. Yet the very sort of informal visit and interviewing that was desirable brought with it the need to be responsive, involved, and also subjective. It appears that most ETS visitors have come to "care about" given schools and about the fulfillment of many MUSE/IGE goals. This puts us in a somewhat precarious position as reporters of fact and attitude; but it also probably accounts to some extent for the richness of the site-visit data and the sense of personal relationship developed. Schools, after all, were not required to submit to our visits. Yet we had to insure the likelihood of second or even third trips to many schools and we conclude that visitor attitude is important to this goal. We are hopeful of visiting a few of these schools again in the fall of 1972, and anticipate no special difficulty in making arrangements with the schools.

Individual School Reports

The bulk of this chapter on site visits is devoted to the case studies and compilations of other findings. In each instance, whether for an official "case-study" school or not, a single sheet is provided which summarizes the data base supporting the study. This form records number of visits,

dates, interviews conducted, materials studied, observations made, and meetings attended; it also indicates attendance at the Preschool Workshop or in-service training, and whether or not responses were received to the winter and spring questionnaires. These summary sheets appear as Appendix J.

The reports are based upon whatever resources were available by the end of the school year. Some schools, being more open to visits than others or having more publications and records, are more fully represented than other schools. (A few principals have mailed in important materials between visits, and some virtually opened their files for perusal). Beyond this sort of limitation, there is an equally important difference in the number and extent of contacts. Because of a variety of scheduling difficulties referred to elsewhere, certain schools in the sample have been visited but once. In addition, inservice training was observed in fewer than half the schools. The Preschool Workshops of five schools were visited. Finally, of course, the employment of different visitors to the same schools has its drawbacks as well as advantages; they have varying perceptions and personalities which may color their findings and reports.

This chapter includes case-studies for each of six 1971-72 schools. After the millieu is described generally, the various areas are traced through the year, indicating earlier and later status along with changes, plans, variations, and extents. Emphasis is on status observed, and activities and information provided; but of necessity subjective assessments (by both visitors and compilers) are involved--especially where school atmosphere, implementation progress, and staff attitudes are concerned. The report provides a summary statement and then describes relationships between questionnaire and visit data. The outline for the narrative report is this:

I. Milieu

A. History and background
B. Unusual situations or conditions
C. Training and exposure prior to implementation
D. Initial steps in installation
E. Nature of plant

II. Operations

F. MUSE organization and roles
G. IGE instruction and IGE subjects
H. Resources available and use of same
I. Parent and community education
J. Unusual activities/decisions related to implementation

III. Overall Status

K. School atmosphere and attitudes
L. Summary statement
M. Follow-up questions
N. Concordance with questionnaire data

School Number 601

I THE MILIEU

A. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND. The School is within a large city district but itself has a mixture of suburban and distinctly rural students. Socio-economic status varies from very poor whites to elite whites with blacks inbetween. The school has about 700 students, has non-segregated faculty and classes, covers grades K-5, and is among several new MUSE/IGE schools in the city.

All indications are that the school was strictly traditional (in terms of building, program, staff, goals, organization) up until this year. There had been no prior attempts at teaming, individualization, or any other MUSE/IGE feature. P learned about new patterns informally and applied to state department for inclusion, with district and school commitment coming in April 1971. District personnel have been generally supportive, and in fact have steered extra funds to this school for materials, addition of aides, etc.

Plans were apparently made early and firmly. The IIC was set up in June; all IIC members attended the statewide staff development training in June and were able to meet and plan as the IIC; a summer decision was made to implement IGE by using the Wisconsin Reading Design; letter to parents (mid-August) provided an overview, credited both the R & D Center and I/D/E/A for their input, and announced (a) creation of the League of schools, (b) complete non-grading of the school, and (c) multiaging; the librarian from the beginning was an important member of the IIC.

At the district level, a local liaison was appointed early, and this person along with the superintendent attended all meetings of the formal training chain except a "national awareness" session. The liaison indicated "interest in team teaching and individualized instruction" as the major consideration underlying district adoption of MUSE/IGE. A district reading consultant was assigned to serve 3 MUSE/IGE schools. From visits as well as questionnaires, it appears that both these persons have been an integral and continuing part of the installation effort at this school.

B. UNUSUAL SITUATIONS OR CONDITIONS. None.

C. TRAINING/EXPOSURE PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION. P and UL, librarian and reading consultant attended staff development training in June. P also attended a meeting for state and district commitment. One day in the spring had been devoted to full-staff awareness and overview of the patterns (at which time a vote was taken: all Yes except 3. Two had been planning to leave anyway, and the third asked for transfer but later changed her mind and has since become "one of the better teachers this year.")

The other training element was the Preschool Workshop held in late August. All staff, teachers, unit leaders, special ed teacher,

librarian, and phys ed teacher attended. Aides, however, were merely introduced and then were free to go. Several comments about the Preschool Workshop will give an idea of where things stood as the school year began.

- P and reading consultant made long formal presentations which were very general in nature; they left most details for "later on in the units." As an overview FOR THE STAFF, it was fairly weak and unstructured. "One at a Time" was shown, without much comment and with no discussion, and it was stated that if other films or strips were to be seen, that was strictly optional within the units. Each teacher received a copy of the two IGE books (Learning Program, Unit Operations); no pep talk about them was provided. In all, MUSE was presented fairly clearly, but IGE programing was left vague.
- For new teachers, as well as those from previous year, the workshop gave little sense of what was in store or where the innovations were headed. However, the atmosphere was fairly relaxed and time was spent later on in working out scheduling details.
- Two circumstances helped to explain the foregoing. The reading consultant had had no chance to work with the Wisconsin Design directly and dealt only on a hearsay basis. P made all decisions during the summer (UL, unit teachers, children assigned, locations in the building, basic schedules, hiring of aides); thus the staff felt no involvement in the decisions and equally were not aware of the nature of the plans. They appeared to have confidence in the P to carry it through, but had little grasp of some of the implications.
- The same may be said of the unit leaders. At the IIC meeting, they were tentative, feeling their way in the new relationship with the principal, sat stiffly in their assigned chairs, and had no questions to ask at the end of the first Workshop day. The IIC was a structure without function at that time. UL obviously were waiting for P to ask questions or raise issues.
- At two of the unit meetings, teachers' concerns emerged. Multiaging fairly floored upper-level teachers, and the planned movement of first graders from room to room was a problem. At lower levels, the main topic (scheduling) was discussed and resolved, as careful plans were laid for the first two weeks only. At upper levels the main topic (grouping and multiaging) was discussed less thoroughly, and that unit ended the day in some dismay. Several teachers indicated their lack of preparation for whatever was expected, and many clung to the notion of "'my children' being farmed out to you" for a subject or an hour.
- It was clear that once the Preschool Workshop got under way, units were to make decisions. They did--as to moving children, reassigning within the unit, selecting subjects teachers would teach, and setting up the unit schedule.

D. INITIAL STEPS IN INSTALLATION. The MUSE structure covered all children and teachers (except special education and kindergarten)

and multiaging was incorporated from the outset. The IIC began meeting in the summer, and included the librarian; however, the units did not meet to plan or make decisions until 3 days prior to school opening. Each of 5 units had an aide available at the beginning of school, whose duties were to be mostly non-instructional (in spite of some being certified teachers). Time was arranged for each unit to meet 30 minutes per day for planning, sharing, working, and IIC was to meet weekly for up to an hour.

An August letter was sent to parents; and a meeting was held in August at which the state coordinator helped to explain the program and answer questions.

As to IGE, it was decided to adopt the Wisonsin Design for word attack skills; plans were made to assess children in September.

At a later time, P indicated that his conception of the "beginning point" of MUSE/IGE installation was the organization of teachers and students into functioning units. This had occurred on August 30 when school opened.

E. NATURE OF PLANT. Self-contained classrooms down the hall, in 3 wings. All on one level. The library is not central, but access is not difficult. (The uninvolved kindergarten, ironically, has two classrooms joined by a large open archway). Cafeteria available (amd sometimes used) for large-group instruction. By October the halls were filled with learning stations, separate desks, study carrels, etc., but the fire marshall insisted on their removal. By January, every other sort of space was being used; this included two appropriate hallway sections where blackboards had been installed.

Library is about size of 2 classrooms, well-stocked with books, A-V, learning materials, special corners, tables, etc. Adequate workrooms for librarian. No barriers in room, so it can be used flexibly.

II OPERATIONS

F. MUSE ORGANIZATION AND ROLES. UL were selected by P on basis of several criteria; P indicated satisfaction with that method and reported that no changes were contemplated for 1972-73. The IIC met in June, August, and thereafter on a weekly schedule. Whereas the UL were hesitant and insecure at the outset (as to the real meaning of IIC decision-making), they grew through the year into a formidable group...a cohesive and meaningful group.

In October the IIC's main concern was scheduling of all sorts (recess, unit blocks, special teachers, planning time). As the visitor interpreted the P's observations, this reflected UL's hesitancy to work on more substantive matters (such as the use of available consultants or reporting to parents). At the same time, P continued to take initative in the meetings and to announce what amounted to his decisions on many matters. It seemed to be a case of his doing what he felt the UL were not ready to do.

By midyear, UL were a different lot. They exerted pressure on the P (both P and 3 UL reported this) to eliminate letter grades, but P was slow to take action or attempt change. Ironically, and interestingly, the tables were turned: earlier P had in effect thrust new leadership roles onto the UL and now they were in turn pressing him for needed decisions to make MUSE/IGE work. Further, UL were indicating to P that teachers were working too hard, and 2 IIC meetings were devoted to slowing down the pace. Finally, P was clearly not aware of many details about unit operations in his school (e.g., whether all teachers taught a given subject or all children); there are obvious objections to this state of affairs, but also obvious: P trusted UL to be on top of things in the units.

On that point, both P and some UL noted that UL did not like the role of the straw boss. They look to P for help in communication and authority on various matters. P responded by having 2 or 3 full faculty meetings to remind them of school's total commitment and to get away from having communication only via the UL. In effect, the UL had been saying to the principal, "Let's you have a prayer meeting" and he managed to lift the spirits of all.

The matter of communication was apparently a recurring problem. The minutes for a December IIC meeting contained this message (verbatim):

> Principal's Directive: Clarifying Communications--
> The Principal directed unit leaders to establish the following policy...relating to unit activities:
>
> 1. All ideas affecting unit operations will be discussed and agreed upon by the entire unit during a unit meeting, with the unit leader presiding.
> 2. Ideas that need to be cleared with the principal will be handled by the unit leader and principal.
> 3. When ideas...are brought to the principal by a staff teacher, that teacher will be referred back to the unit leader for appropriate unit consideration of the problem.

In May, the IIC continued to be a solid, decisive group, outlining school problems and laying out plans for next year. One example of P's strategy was observed: He quietly wondered whether scheduled recess is outmoded; UL responded with discussion and decision to take it back to the units prior to a determination. (The chances are pretty good that next year recess will be handled by and within units, as needed).

By year's end, P and UL indicated their satisfaction with their new roles. P was easy-going but direct and determined about MUSE/IGE success. The UL (or rather, 4 of the 5) appeared to share his enthusiasm and commitment, had learned to function in the IIC, and wished to continue in the UL role.

At the unit level, it was noted that most meetings (as observed on 4 occasions) were well-led, generally productive, and open for full participation. In these respects, the primary unit was outstanding,

and the others were very satisfactory. The other strong force in this school--in what was probably not a changed role--was the librarian. She too was determined: to use the facility and materials for all sorts of groups, for learning centers, and for every minute of the day. She considered herself a teacher, felt she should be an IIC member, stayed informed on all matters, attended major training sessions, and attended unit meetings as a matter of course.

IIC meetings were regularly preceded by agendas and most always followed by minutes (which were distributed to the total staff). The tone of the minutes clearly showed that they were intended for communication to all. Perusal of the log covering the period September-May shows overall emphasis on matters of moment: grouping children, grading, IGE subject areas, guides to use, scheduling, contact with parents, developing behaviorial objectives, and other important topics. Typically, and worthy of note, the minutes reported on more subjects than had been scheduled in the agenda. And, typically, they were friendly as well as informative documents. Often they included an accounting of unit-by-unit plans and specific progress--as well as kudos.

Multiaging had been a concern at the outset, particularly at upper levels. By year's end, it was still a concern to some, but it was taken for granted. On at least 3 occasions, multiaging was credited with allowing the flexibility of attitude needed to solve certain social problems; children were placed in other units and then began to behave, learn, succeed.

In connection with the units themselves, the psychological walls between rooms slowly tumbled down during the year. Though separate classrooms were the rule, the halls were busy with cross traffic (teachers and students) between rooms within the unit areas. It did develop that as few as 8 or as many as 80 students were taught at one time in unit activities, and it did happen that texts were flexibly used much of the time, teachers shared their materials and ideas, and most teachers became less preoccupied with grades and grade levels.

Still, differences across units obtained. For example, in the primary unit, the 4 teachers were departmentalized across all subjects; except for reading and word attack skills, a given subject was taught by one teacher only. They organized their 4 rooms as follows: 1 for assembly of all (N-110); 2 for organized instruction of various-sized groups in and out all day; 1 for a variety of subject-area learning centers. On the other hand, an upper-level unit had all 4 teachers teaching reading, math, social studies, and art...and there were "specializations" only in science and language arts. Such decisions and use of personnel were in the purview of the individual units.

In a third unit, all teachers taught all subjects and nearly all children. At one point in the case of math, 2 teachers each had 30 students, discussed teacher strengths and student needs, and worked out a new pattern: one teacher taught 40, while the other took on 2 groups of 10. ("Something we wouldn't have dreamed of last year.")

Back to the primary unit, here is what happened during a unit meeting observed at midyear: The reading consultant had encouraged regrouping in skills areas, and in the conversation it became evident to the teachers that they had been teaching story-reading without knowing what the others were doing...using the same books, same techniques, and in effect wasting resources. They were stunned at the realization. After discovering the duplication of effort, they regrouped themselves and the children right then and there (with appropriate social and skill considerations). An educational drama.

Though separated at the outset, by midyear the special education children were partially incorporated into the several units. The arrangement was not irreversible, but it permitted placement for part of the day and involved the inclusion of 2 special ed teachers in 3 unit organizations, so to speak.

Units were expected to keep logs but this was a responsibility for which there was little time or inclination. Some records were kept.

Partly because of the building's structure, and partly because of personal approaches, there was very little actual team teaching in this school...where 2 or 3 teachers dealt at once with the same group of students. However, the units did plan and arrange together, came more and more to regroup kids, combined teacher strengths, and increasingly made use of more free flow of students and materials.

Finally, there were of course human relations problems along the way. The "freedom" each unit had to structure its resources was a partial answer to some of those difficulties; and, as the year progressed, some teachers tuned in more as they saw students busier and happier, realized 4 teachers could provide more than one, and found the whole situation less threatening. The principal and reading consultant together worked out means by which certain teachers kept their individuality (their own styles, their pet projects, etc.) without sacrificing the purposes of team planning and effort. One way was to find a personal project of each teacher in the unit. Another was to ask some teachers to begin planning for other subject areas (objectives, materials, etc.) in committees where UL were not eligible to serve as chairmen.

G. IGE INSTRUCTION AND IGE SUBJECTS. The Wisconsin Design word attack skills was chosen for implementation. Preassessment was conducted in September and in all units students were then grouped for skill instruction. Two units continued fairly smoothly through the year; but two others came to a point of discouragement. They dropped it for 2 months or so before picking it up again. After retesting in January, they proceeded for the remainder of the year.

The value of the Wisconsin Design for providing an instructional framework was recognized...it served as a basis for understanding the programing concepts of objectives, assessment, grouping, and instruction. There were problems, however, in relating materials to children's needs, in recording progress, and in feeling comfortable about regrouping.

In October, teachers from 3 units indicated that they felt it important to vary the IGE approach with word attack skills. They did not limit the program to a prescribed time (e.g., 2 weeks) per skill per group, and did not teach a given skill every day. Without such variation, they felt the approach would be too mechanical. By May, the system had pretty well smoothed out in all units, and regrouping with the McBee cards was accomplished easily and efficiently.

There remained variations, however, as revealed in the detailed questionnaires. Four of five units reported that they continued to group on general ability criteria (high, medium, low) while also grouping on the basis of skill assessment. Three units reported teaching "groups of changing composition" but two others had "regular groups based on general ability" as their typical teaching approach in word attack skills. Moreover, the IIC indicated that "presenting the IGE subject along the lines of the instructional programing model" was not a current activity but a goal for the following year. The IIC also reported that while 75% of its time was directed to "general management and personnel relations", only 10% was devoted to "monitoring IGE implementation."

Very slowly through the year, IGE programing and the example of the Wisconsin Design began to influence work with other subjects. There continued to be emphasis by some teachers on particular textbook coverage and reference to "grade-level" work--but by midyear one unit was regrouping students in science and social studies (on "general" bases) and another was making gross judgements for grouping and regrouping students in math. They appeared to recognize that they were not following any strict model, but needed to move very slowly.

By May there were two outcomes related to these efforts. First, IMS (Individualized Math System, a published curriculum) was selected for adoption in 1972-73, and placement testing was scheduled for late May. Careful planning was done with the help of the district liaison: how best to use aides, what supplemental materials to have available, how to keep records. Second, some teachers were meeting after school--on their own time--to work out gross and refined objectives in social studies, science, health...as a prelude to continued expansion of IGE principles.

H. RESOURCES AVAILABLE AND USE OF SAME.

The school is active in the state League of schools (and the principal is a member of its Hub committee). P, UL, and librarian attended several League training functions during the year, and, according to IIC minutes, reported back to the staff that these were valuable sessions.

Using several implementation guides, the IIC developed its own informal timetable with emphasis on IGE programing. In fulfilling the goals, the school called on a variety of resources: state coordinator, district liaision, the IGE printed materials, visiting consultants, staff of other schools, district reading consultant, and the League. Contact with these persons and groups is recorded in IIC minutes and represents continuing communication and effort. In addition, the principal and one UL (chosen by lots) attended and R & D Center-sponsored midyear training workshop.

Aides (one per unit) were employed fulltime. They began as noninstructional aides but quickly graduated into responsible work with children and materials along with other duties.

UL and a few teachers made scheduled visits to other MUSE/IGE schools in the vicinity. They purposely chose schools which were multiaged and had separate classrooms down the hall in order to match their own situation.

The library/IMC was observed in constant use for varied purposes. Children had scheduled visits by classroom, but were also free to use the facilities for projects, learning center activities, etc. Aides had various lessons with groups of 4 to 10 in the library while all other activities were proceeding. The librarian encouraged such multiple use of the facility and reported increasingly valuable use by students (and a few teachers).

Two observations are made: the great share of the MUSE/IGE preparation and training was directed to P and UL; except for what UL might pass on, staff teachers were given much less opportunity to talk, study, improve skills, etc. Second, there was very little inservice training in this school for the whole staff; most of what there was took place in early fall. An IIC meeting in May took up the issue and all members agreed that there had been too little and of inadequate auality. Indefinite plans were discussed for improving the situation in 1972-73.

Of the 5 units, 3 reported having inservice training within the unit, for a total of from 3 to 5 hours. Filmstrips were discussed, IGE booklets were used, and unit operations were considered, but the emphasis was on the IGE subject area.

In relation to overall training, P lamented the "thinness of expertise in our school," and felt that he and UL were not adequate to take on staff training. "Staff teachers are getting it all third-hand and that is not acceptable." Not surprisingly, staff teachers as a group felt similarly. The May questionnaires revealed dissatisfaction with the timing and amount of training on the part of 9 teachers; one indicated (as of May) a need for a workshop "to give all teachers an idea of the workings of IGE...an overview of IGE and the total program."

An IIC decision made in May: in 1972-73 to include 2 or 3 staff teachers in every IIC meeting in order to improve communications and to let teachers see the decision-making process at work.

I. PARENT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION. The weekly newsletter was a major means of communication. It contained miscellany, but almost always dealt with progress, plans, reports, or problems related to installation. Parents were told about visiting schools, about visitors from I/D/E/A and elsewhere, about multiaging, the new math program, and so on. In addition, a letter in August carefully outlined some changes which parents should expect. Parents were not asked about "going IGE," but they were certrainly kept informed.

J. UNUSUAL ACTIVITIES/DECISIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION. The impression is clear that this school staff planned from the outset to "follow the guide" and set things up right away (MUSE structure, IGE subject-area, library/IMC, parent education, multiaging, etc.) This was not exactly unusual, but among visit schools it was notable. Many schools started out with a halfway attitude, perhaps of necessity, but this did not seem to be the case here.

In several states, under the aegis of I/D/E/A, schools hosted a new crop of coordinators for a week's training and observation. This school was one of them. It was no doubt chosen by the coordinator because of its general implementation success and ability to serve as a working model; by the same token, the staff benefited from the experience of having visitors who themselves were students of the MUSE and IGE innovations.

III OVERALL STATUS

K. SCHOOL ATMOSPHERE AND ATTITUDES. Implicit in the above is an atmosphere conducive to both individualized student learning and the introduction of change. Staff members on the whole do feel that their preparation was inadequate, their needs great, and their expectations probably too high--but this was countered by positive attitudes and a high degree of genuine dedication. The UL grew fairly quickly into the IIC roles, the principal shared authority, the librarian created an IMC to the extent possible, parents lent support, and teachers by and large felt unthreatened by the new unit setup. Of particular note, as staff saw that various parts of the model "worked," they accepted them and moved onto other matters.

All of this is the more noteworthy when it's remembered that in 1970-71 this was a traditional school right down the line.

As to reported attitudes, P felt in May that 75% of the staff were enthusiastic about both MUSE and IGE, 15% were agreeable, and 10% neutral or cautious. (His own feeling was enthusiasm for both MUSE and IGE). Of 19 teachers responding, 18 reported agreeable and enthusiastic attitudes about the new patterns, reflecting P's assessment. One teacher was obviously very unhappy, moving from enthusiasm in September to caution in May with a footnote about "being on the bottom of the chain of command."

Children, too, were favorably inclined to the new regimes. Comparisons are hard to make, but teachers repeatedly mentioned increased involvement and academic growth, and the P reported increased attendance along with decreased behavior and discipline problems. Asked about children's attitudes in the midyear visit, one teacher said, "Don't ask me. Ask them...they'll tell you how its different from last year. We all like it better this way."

L. SUMMARY STATEMENT. Overall there was marked growth in both attitude toward MUSE/IGE and skill in implementing the patterns in this school. To the outside observer, the situation looked "questionable" at the time of the Preschool Workshop, but great strides were made during the year as the guides were followed, as the IIC leadership potential was developed,

and as outside resources were called upon for assistance. This school is serious about its commitment to change.

Parent and community relations appeared to be successful and communications were regular. The district administration was also supportive--in terms of money, personnel, and training.

MUSE appeared to develop and blossom more fully than IGE. The MUSE structure was planned at the outset and grew stronger through the year, and the IIC worked fairly hard to solve the recurring problems of morale and communications with staff teachers. Unit teams developed skills in planning and sharing, and indicated in May their preference for working as units and teaching together. IGE, however, although begun with the Wisconsin Design in word attack skills, did not appear to be as firmly rooted. By year's end the instructional programing model was not being followed implicitly and there were difficulties in assessing, grouping, and instructing. These varied across units, however, and there were instances of close adherence to the model. The prognosis is good, moreover, because of the selection of a packaged curriculum in math for next year which itself follows the instructional model.

Problems which continued to concern the staff included human relations in the faculty, the lack of adequate inservice training before and during the school year for staff teachers, and teacher inability to move away from the textbook and single-grade orientations of the past. Again, in all cases, the prognosis is good--since the problems surfaced, were recognized, and attempts were made to deal with them.

Several impacts were noted: improved attendance and decreased discipline problems; elimination of failure as a grade; development of group processes among teachers; evaluation and recruitment of teachers in terms of the new patterns; increased participation by the principal in the instructional program; and interdependent relationships with other schools.

Of the four "initiation criteria" announced by the R & D Center, the situation at the end of the year was as follows:

1. Active IIC...yes
2. Multiaging of students...yes
3. Operation of IGE subject-area...yes
4. Full unitization...no (kindergarten separate)

M. FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS. In view of the report above, certain questions remain to be answered as this school continues implementation next year.

a. Has inservice for the staff been improved and increased?
b. Are projected arches and doorways between rooms completed...and used?
c. Will the kindergarten(s) be incorporated into the primary unit?
d. Is there increased teamwork in the classroom (above and beyond the planning room)?
e. Do teachers increase their use of the library/IMC as an instructional resource?

f. Will human relations problems decrease in frequency and importance?
g. Will the school continue to incorporate special-education students into the units, or will that "experiment" be dropped?
h. Will upper-level teachers move closer to the instructional programing model and away from the textbook and course of study?

N. CONCORDANCE WITH QUESTIONNAIRE DATA. The only discrepancy noted was in the rating of unit leaders. In interview, P reported concern and dissatisfaction with one UL; in the questionnaire he rated all UL as doing the UL job either adequately or well (on several dimensions). Otherwise, the visits confirmed, as well as amplified upon, data provided in questionnaires.

(13.) Schools are implementing MUSE and IGE in different ways and on different schedules. As an aid in summarizing certain overall practices across schools this year, please answer each item below with a yes or no, indicating present operations and features of your school's MUSE/IGE implementation.

Detailed Questionnaire--final IIC item

	YES	NO
1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis?	✓	
(b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program?	✓	
2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material?		✓
(b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers?		✓
3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)?		
(b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program?	✓	
4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?"	✓	
(b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal?	✓	
5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)?		
(b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children?	✓	
6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program?	✓	
(b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches?	✓	
7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time?	✓	
(b) Is it being implemented in all the units?		✓
(c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject?		✓
8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching?	✓	
(b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?"	✓	
9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units?	✓	
(b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit?		✓
10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model?	✓	
(b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units?		✓
11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure?	✓	
(b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time?	✓	
12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff?		✓
(b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school?	✓	
(c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance?	✓	

Four Most Serious Problem Areas
Noted by IIC in Detailed Questionnaire

1. Grouping students for instruction.
2. Discipline, noise, confusion
3. Materials and equipment in the IMC/library.
4. Location of IMC/library; accessibility & size.

School Number 103

I THE MILIEU

A. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND. With about 420 students, this school serves a mixed rural and suburban area, mostly white. It covers grades K-6 and is in fairly close proximity to other MUSE/IGE schools.

In past, school participated in team teaching, individualization, differentiated staffing, and development of a learning resources center. District has required of all schools certain practices that make MUSE/IGE work: an objectives-based math program, minimum inservice training, use of aides, and pilot testing of the Wisconsin R & D study skills program.

Though there are 6 MUSE/IGE schools in the district, no attempt was made this year to articulate among them or to develop a district policy committee. Moreover, the district has not provided special help or inservice training concerning MUSE/IGE, and no district representative (including the assigned liaison) attended any training or exposure activity. There appears to be considerable district ferment about change and exploration, but little or no assistance to these particular new patterns. One exception: district permitted school to reapportion staff in terms of funds available; thus they hired 2 aides in place of 1 teacher. (The IIC indicated in the May questionnaire that 1 of the 3 most serious problems was "level of support and cooperation from district personnel.").

In late 1970-71 the school was reorganized and this made it possible to select staff for 1971-72 who were in tune with the new concepts. The total staff selected UL and grouped teachers into units. The IIC was set up in April 1971 and decided to continue the use of the Wisconsin Design for word attack as the IGE subject-area in 1971-72.

B. UNUSUAL SITUATIONS OR CONDITIONS. Because MUSE/IGE had been installed in the state last year, there already existed two support systems to aid in installation: (a) strong League association of schools and (b) universities with on-call consultants.

The District required teachers to participate in certain inservice activities for recertification purposes. This made it difficult to conduct MUSE/IGE-related inservice as needed for the staff.

C. TRAINING/EXPOSURE PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION. The staff was well represented at four of the five training-chain elements (excepting a "national overview" session). Even parents (2) and aides (3) were included in the 1-day school-awareness meeting where films were used to explain the new patterns. In addition, full faculty meetings in May and June provided for planning, assignments, and overview.

P and the 4 UL attended 3-day staff-development training in April, and were able to meet as an IIC there for a number of hours. P assessed the workshop as "very good" and felt major goals had been accomplished.

The 3-day Preschool Workshop was attended by the whole school staff. The attempt made to use the IGE films for discussion was partially successful, though there was a lack of enthusiasm for this aspect. Several films and filmstrips were used. The observer concluded that discussion and planning were much better handled in the unit level meetings than in the general session. (Information was leaked to the effect that for some of the staff the September meeting represented a 2nd or even 3rd viewing of the same films).

The Preschool agenda was carefully drawn up and covered most matters of possible concern. Much time was devoted to separate unit meetings, scheduling, organizing materials, and trying to internalize IGE instructional programing. Many teachers indicated two major concerns at that time: (a) scheduling within and across units, and (b) interpersonal relationships in the newly formed units. (Units were "free" to work out both problem areas). Unit meetings included aides and interns, and concentrated on first-week plans. These September meetings were the first formal unit meetings.

D. INITIAL STEPS IN INSTALLATION. At the time school opened, the IIC had been formed, had met, and had begun to function as a governing group. It consisted of P and 4 UL. The MUSE structure covered all teachers and children, including kindergarten, on a multiaged basis. Both the IIC and the units had special weekly meeting times arranged.

A "specials" unit was set up at the outset (see section F).

After two weeks, the units began dealing with the Wisconsin Design word-attack area: assessment and grouping.

Units decided at the outset what each teacher's "special area of competency" would be; teachers would serve as resource persons in one subject area for the whole unit: math, music, social studies, reading.

The library and learning resources center were not staffed fulltime. A tradeoff had been effected: in order to have unit aides it was necessary to have less than half-time coverage of the IMC facilities.

Later, P indicated that his conception of the "beginning point" of MUSE/IGE installation was the staff's decision to be committed to MUSE/IGE. This had occurred during the previous spring.

E. NATURE OF PLANT. Self-contained classrooms opening onto hallways, plus 3 classroom-sized separate buildings. Library and learning centers are centrally located, and fairly accessible to older children in the outbuildings. Cafeteria available (and sometimes used) for large-group instruction, quiet study, etc.

Library and learning resources center (separate large rooms) have learning centers, A-V, carrels, much table and workspace, and plenty of space for staff. All areas are capable of being very flexibly used.

Two classrooms were converted into unit workrooms for storage, meeting, planning, materials, special testing and tutoring, etc. Two units per room.

II OPERATIONS

F. MUSE ORGANIZATION AND ROLES. UL were elected by staff teachers in the previous spring; 2 of the 4 will be replaced for 1972-3 because they don't wish to maintain the UL responsibility. One in fact was so disenchanted with MUSE/IGE as to resign from the school. Replacements were selected by units from a list set up by P.

IIC includes P and UL, though school secretary and part-time librarian frequently attend meetings. Regular printed agendas and minutes revealed an overwhelming concern in the fall with administrivia and school operations (buses, recess, visit policies) but by spring IIC had moved to more substantive instructional matters. P helped this transition, he feels, by having set main topics for consecutive IIC meetings; operations, staffing, IGE subjects, and instruction were the main ones.

One unusual IIC function was to choose topics of concern which should go before the whole faculty weekly meeting for discussion and resolution. The faculty meeting often did not have any weighty matters to consider, though they did have a voice in scheduling, hiring aides rather than a teacher, inservice plans, and the like. It more often served for announcements, but in this sense it avoided having only a P-to-UL-to-teacher communications hierarchy.

P indicated (in May) certain reservations about the IIC. He wondered if he had provided enough "open leadership" and lamented IIC's lack of imagination at times. In particular, P noted that the IIC does not review the unit's instructional plans. There were indications that he was somewhat rigid and dominated various meetings, and this might explain UL hesitancy and the fact that in two faculty meetings observed there were virtually no questions or discussion. He also seems more concerned than most P's with straight lines in the hallways and orderliness in the classrooms. (It was also noted that even into the spring, P was struggling to get response from UL's. One bulletin stated, "Since I didn't have any recommendations from any of the units, I have gone ahead to plan...and a copy will be attached..."

There was no librarian, IMC director, or resource coordinator. One teacher served all these capacities on part-time basis, and thus was not really in the "IMC role." There was also one aide.

In connection with the units, apparently here too P had difficulty in influencing procedures. At year's end, he said, for example, that there had been very little inservice in the units, though he had kept pushing for it. Also that units had spent meeting time working on papers or projects and gave short shrift to planning, resources, instructional decisions, etc. He had tried to encourage the latter by getting a table for units to "meet at." A third problem was that "unit meetings are not always democratic or productive." He had tried to show the importance of their having agendas and planning together...but with little success. One can conclude from all this that (a) communications between P and units were at a fairly low level, and (b) units were loosely organized and functioned minimally.

The primary unit included K-1-2 children, but actual instruction was otherwise. As some Kg's became ready for reading, they were grouped at times with students in the grade 1-2 sections; but in effect, the Kindergarten was a separate entity most of the time. To change this, the decision was made that next year all Kg children will attend in the morning (only) and thus can be an integral part of this unit for language arts instruction.

Units did not prepare meeting agendas or keep logs of their activities. Typically they had 3 hours for weekly meetings...and UL's had one other hour for personal planning.

A "specials" unit was formed for art, music, phys ed, and science teachers. It functioned as a unit (with UL, planning time, and aide) with concern for scheduling courses among the 3 regular units; it also had opportunities for tutoring and special enrichment activities. Children from a regular unit would all go to "specials" at the same time, but to different subjects. P explained the inclusion of science: (a) made for better school scheduling and freed units for planning time, (b) teacher is "so good that he should work in all the units."

P screens all applicants (teachers, aides, interns) and then units make decisions after their own interviews. New teachers and aides for 1972-73 were selected in this way.

Substantive topics at observed unit meetings included the arrangements for assessing word attack skills (in the fall), identification of kids with family and emotional difficulties (midyear), assignment of students to instructional levels for next year (late spring). The latter meeting made clear some implementation pitfalls. The task was to indicate status in math (which had for 3 months been taught as an IGE subject in this primary unit) as the basis for placement next September. Three of the 4 teachers (the 4th was at a desk busily grading and organizing papers) discussed the matter of an index, finally decided to report by ability level within grade level. Thus, Mary was rated 2-, Boyce was 1, Karen 2, and so on. A single index was employed to cover all math aspects, and moreover, from memory with no reference to notes or records. "That'll be good enough", "They'll know what we mean", "We can't be too picky on this", were typical remarks, as was the UL's summary on Lucinda: "Yaas, she's doing grade 2 work even though she's in grade 1."

As noted from all sources, teachers have moved fairly slowly toward an "IGE point of view" and the MUSE organization. There appeared to be little sense of unit-y except in the meetings; otherwise instruction took place in multiaged but self-contained classrooms. However, through scheduling and selection of subject areas, teachers did come into regular contact with the majority of kids in their units.

G. IGE INSTRUCTION AND IGE SUBJECTS. The Wisconsin Design word attack skills was the IGE subject-area. This school had field-tested the Design in the previous year and was well acquainted with it. Still, there were implementation difficulties; by mid-October the system was not yet off the

ground, and assessment had not been completed. Instruction often related to reading skills but was not bound to particular assessed needs at that time; the instructional programing model had not yet come into its own. A November IIC meeting accordingly dealt with "Planning for Individualized Reading."

Plans and discussion--on reading--were a regular part of IIC agendas into the spring, with continued effort to refine the procedures and development of materials files. By the February visit, there was increased evidence of "IGE in action" according to the programing model with the Wisconsin Design. P, UL, and teachers felt that their progress was satisfactory and that they had implemented the purposes.

The same may not be said concerning math, however, which was taken on as a sort of optional IGE subject at about midyear. Inservice training, behavioral objectives, and procedures had been provided in a math program which had been made "continuous" over 6 difficulty levels. The levels looked and felt like "grade levels" and were so treated, though P had expected that the levels would not get in the way of IGE programing. As noted above, teachers in one unit interpreted the program in grade level terms without reference to the separate skill areas which had been taught.

Though the math program was adopted, apparently the IIC had made no provision for articulating it among the units, and each unit operated independently. Moreover, records (by topic and level) were not as carefully kept as for the word-attack program. As one UL noted, "Our only commitment is to reading We do the best we can in math." In an upper-level unit, accordingly, children were grouped only within classroom groups and not within the unit as a whole. The UL did not know what was going on in the other 2 rooms of the unit...so far as math was concerned.

H. RESOURCES AVAILABLE AND USE OF SAME. School is active in its League, and P feels it is a most valuable connection; "could not get along without it." It makes concerted action easier, provides inservice, makes certain funding more efficient, and encourages mutual assistance. P also noted that too much League effort goes to training P and UL only; he appealed to the League, a poll was taken, and "learning styles" was decided as topic for inservice for staff teachers. An April workshop was attended by those (from this school) in one unit, and another unit will attend in the fall. Such training gets to those who need it, but slowly.

Only 1 unit reported having its own inservice training (about 4 hours).

Using only the I/D/E/A implementation guide, the IIC developed an informal timetable for the school's implementation plan. As noted in May, the IIC felt that it was behind that schedule, principally in terms of IGE programing. Resources used included state coordinator, IGE printed materials, I/D/E/A guide, district consultants, and the League, with greatest reliance on the last two.

Most inservice training reached less than the whole staff. Ten hours of autumn training in reading, for example, was not directed to the whole

staff. In connection with math, a course (offered through the district) was given in the winter-spring months, and was held at this school. "Six or eight" of the teachers attended, hardly the total staff. This of course has implications for the success of instructional programing in the IGE subject areas.

Aides in all League schools received formal training in the fall (about 10 hours). Aides had many responsibilities, including instructional tasks.

The school did not have scheduled inservice during the fall; in the spring, however, 2 provisions were made for the whole staff. First, one hour per month was devoted to review of the IGE films and other materials and this was apparently done 3 times. Second, a special 4-hour program was conducted in February for review of IGE materials and concepts, self-assessment using I/D/E/A instruments, and discussion of future plans.

A number of staff participated in school visits, League training, special reading conferences, and a conference on the open classroom.

The library/IMC/Learning Center is of potential great value in this school's program. The facilities are spacious and well-stocked. But understaffed. And therefore underused. Observations in these rooms showed very few students in the learning centers, and even fewer using the library. Much discussion during year about (a) moving facilities so all are "under one roof" and (b) adding staff. At year's end, no firm decision on either matter.

There does not appear to be an "IMC concept" here which would place the IMC at the heart of instructional programs. Rather, many materials are stored and used in the units. Moreover, browing, exploring, and "just reading" are not encouraged. Access to these facilities is tightly controlled by passes which must indicate the child's "reason" for attending or his intention to use a particular learning center. A February notice included the statement "Children are not to touch any of the equipment without the supervision of a teacher or an aide."

I. PARENT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION. P feels strongly that parents strongly support the changes and program. A number of parents responded to invitations to make daytime visits, and a school "Booster's Committee" was set up as a way of enrolling volunteers, providing moral support, and keeping parents informed.

An advisory parent committee was informed of school's intentions in April of 1971. This was followed by a May parent meeting to explain the particulars (at which UL as well as P made presentations) and to use an IGE film. Parents (at least those of the advisory committee) were invited to attend the Preschool Workshop--and 2 did. Then there was a September open house, followed by a series of tours in the fall (attended by over 200 parents in all). In November, at conference time, 2 full days and an evening were set aside to provide enough time for discussion and questions as well as progress reports on children.

J. UNUSUAL ACTIVITIES/DECISIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION. P has actively participated in unit planning and teaching as well as observing and testing, on a scheduled basis, through the year. Units were advised of the schedule, and P requested specific curriculum plans. He had hoped to spend about 70% of his time in this instructional activity (and ended up with a very sizable 40%).

In evaluating teachers, P employed the 12 criteria presented in the IGE Principal's Handbook, both in writing and in the personnel interview. Such specific criteria had never been used before, and he feels that the conferences have become much more meaningful.

The total staff was polled in early spring on evaluative questions concerning implementation progress and personal needs. The IIC studied the responses with an eye to making certain decisions about 1972-73. One decision--mostly on the part of P--was to eliminate the Preschool Workshop.

The state implementation agency asked each teacher to sign a statement of commitment to MUSE/IGE continuation in April. The implication was that continued support by the agency was dependent upon receipt of a strong indication of individual commitment. In addition, the district required all staff to review the elements of the school's commitment and to sign--indicating willingness to continue with the MUSE and IGE patterns.

III OVERALL STATUS

K. SCHOOL ATMOSPHERE AND ATTITUDES. At year's end, P indicated several reservations about the operations of the IIC and the units, and expressed concern (to visitors and to the staff in open meetings) about the adequacy of IGE implementation in reading. P appears not to have complete confidence in the staff or the UL who were elected, and accordingly runs a fairly tight ship. Similarly, teachers did not appear completely comfortable in the IIC and unit structures. There were clear indications of less than open communication in the school. The full faculty meeting observed in May was more a monologue; there was little give-and-take, little discussion, and no questions.

As to atmosphere apparently there was a change over the year. Toward the beginning a sense of excitement and commitment was evident, but toward the end the school did not have a pervasive tone that said "this is a good place to learn and teach." Frustrations were evident (taking on math, half-usable library/IMC, communications) among the staff, and children simply did not evidence the spirit of inquiry and good use of opportunity that were noted elsewhere.

On the other hand in the May questionnaires, 10 of 13 responding teachers indicated their preference for spending most or all of the time working "as a unit"; P reported his own attitudes as enthusiastic concerning MUSE and IGE; and teachers on the whole were either agreeable or enthusiastic toward both patterns. One might infer that the school's staff were tired in May and simply were not teaching and working up to the level of their actual attitudes; and morale may have been low because of knowing that 2 UL would not be resuming that role.

L. SUMMARY STATEMENT. The overall atmosphere does not seem completely conducive to the best interests of MUSE and IGE. There are communications problems among the staff and a lack of unity in serious pursuit of the MUSE/IGE patterns.

IGE seems to be developed adequately in word-attack skills and the instructional programing procedures are being followed to a large degree. The picture is very different with math; taking on math at midyear seems to have been a burden to the staff.

Parent relationships and support seem to be satisfactory.

IGE programing is a little ahead of MUSE organization here. The IIC appears not to be in complete charge of the program, units are having trouble fulfilling the goals of planning and other team functions, and, as noted, 2 UL will be replaced. Decision-making has been decentralized to some extent, however. Units have space, materials, planning time, and plenty of challenges to make MUSE a reality here.

Impacts noted include P's use of IGE criteria in evaluating teachers, P's considerable participation in the instructional program, reduced number of discipline problems, and better utilization of resources in the subject areas.

Inservice training has been quite minimal, and some teachers have had virtually none. Staff teachers in general have been bypassed in favor of P and UL, but there is concern about this and plans to improve situation next year have been made.

The IMC concept appears not to be operative in this school. The facility is adequate and well-supplied, but is not as yet viewed or used as a pivotal force in the instructional program.

Of the four "initiation criteria" announced by the R & D Center, the situation at the end of the year was as follows (with implied reservations noted above):

1. Active IIC...yes
2. Multiaging of students...yes
3. Operation of IGE subject-area...yes
4. Full unitization...yes/no

M. FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS. In view of the report above, certain questions remain to be answered as this school proceeds in MUSE/IGE implementation.

a. Can the school improve the "inservice situation" by having MUSE/IGE inservice count toward the district's requirements?
b. Will the units begin to function more in line with P's expectations?
d. What sort of arrangements will be made to staff the library/IMC so that best use can be made of that resource by students and teachers?
d. Will there be opportunity to develop good instructional programing in math, along with the word-attack program?
e. What will develop concerning integration of kindergarten into the instructional program of the primary unit?

f. Will the P be able to develop more confidence in the IIC?
g. Do intra-staff communications improve? Will the atmosphere appear more open?
h. Will teachers increasingly drop reliance on grade-level concepts?
i. Will the librarian/IMC director become a member of the IIC?

N. CONCORDANCE WITH QUESTIONNAIRE DATA. Visits and questionnaires corroborated one another, with one exception. The questionnaires reported that the kindergarten was a part of the primary unit, and thus the school was fully unitized; however, visits showed that this was an organizational status and that instruction itself was separate for kindergarten and grades 1-2.

(13.) Schools are implementing MUSE and IGE in different ways and on different schedules. As an aid in summarizing certain overall practices across schools this year, please answer each item below with a yes or no, indicating present operations and features of your school's MUSE/IGE implementation.

Detailed Questionnaire--final IIC item

	YES	NO
1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis?	X	
(b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program?	X	
2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material?	X	
(b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers?	X	
3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)?	X	
(b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program?	X	
4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?"	X	
(b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal?	X	
5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)?	X	
(b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children?	X	
6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program?	X	
(b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches?		X
7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time?	X	
(b) Is it being implemented in all the units?	X	
(c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject?		X
8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching?	X	
(b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?"	X	
9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units?	X	
(b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit?		X
10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model?		X
(b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units?		X
11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure?	X	
(b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time?	X	
12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff?	X	
(b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school?	X	
(c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance?	X	

Three Most Serious Problem Areas Noted by IIC in Detailed Questionnaire

1. Implementing the IGE instructional programing model.
2. Level of support/cooperation from district personnel.
3. Children's adjustments to the new routines.

School Number 913

I THE MILIEU

A. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND. The town has one elementary school (grades 1-7) with approximately 900 students. P reported that in prior years the school has had aides, some team teaching, and cross-grade groups in reading in grade two; in addition, this year, exploratory work has been done with the open-classroom in five grades. P and staff have been most receptive to MUSE/IGE but at the same time feel that they already have been practicing its basic elements.

P became aware of MUSE/IGE informally, inquired about the R & D Center's plans, and then applied to the state department of education for inclusion in the installation scheme. The superintendent, and particularly the Board of Education, have been supportive and helpful; this includes considerable expenditure for materials, travel, and summer 1972 workshops. The Board's formal monthly Newsletter has pushed the concepts and informed parents simultaneously. The superintendent went on record with this view:

> "(Our) participation in no way represents a wholesale adoption of a rigidly defined research model. On the contrary, flexible adaptation will be the rule."

B. UNUSUAL SITUATIONS OR CONDITIONS. The open-classroom concept has caught on here, to the extent that about two/thirds of responding parents indicated in May their preference for it. There are probably not enough trained teachers to handle these numbers; also, there are ideological differences between open-classroom and MUSE/IGE. While some staff members hold that both approaches are headed in the same direction, others see MUSE/IGE as much more structured and bound to defined curricula, and thus they reject it. They are different enough in conception that 2 distinct "schools" are planned for next year and different enough in definition that parents had an actual choice to make.

The staff voted in January 1972 to proceed with IGE exploration and planning during the spring. A second vote was scheduled for June to determine whether or not to implement MUSE/IGE formally in the fall of 1972. Superintendent insists that such a vote be conducted, to be sure of staff sentiment. This is doubly important since the state teachers association has raised serious objections to the implementation of MUSE/IGE, publicly.

The state department facilitators have contracted with a university to ascertain staff attitudes, opinions about priorities, preferences for teaming, and so on. A series of questionnaires (on a planned schedule) have sought this information during the spring, and feedback to schools is planned for early fall.

C. TRAINING/EXPOSURE PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION. Total staff have seen various IGE films, have been provided the booklets, and during the spring began meeting and planning as the IIC and units. A 1-day session in the winter served as an overview; a few teachers have attended a reading workshop and other staff have been at a League activity. P and UL attended the formal staff development workshop (state-sponsored) in March. Unit meetings and full staff sessions round out this picture of "exposure" during the spring.

The school does not consider that it has implemented IGE as yet; the spring's activities are directed toward fall 1972 implementation. This is anomalous; part of the MUSE structure is operative, and units are planning toward next year. P reported in the first questionnaire that "Jan/Feb 1972" was date of becoming a MUSE/IGE school, but with a footnote indicating "partial implementation."

D. INITIAL STEPS IN INSTALLATION. These are described above. The spring period of planning and setting up the MUSE structure amount to the initial steps. Clearly, IGE-ing has only been explored, while MUSE has been put into operation as the school's organizational structure.

E. PLANT. The "building" actually comprises several additions to the original, all connected by tunnels or doorways. This is particularly conducive to schools within the school, and plans are to take advantage of this situation next year. On the other hand, this places the library far away from the older children who would most likely derive greatest benefit from a library/IMC.

II OPERATIONS

F. MUSE ORGANIZATION AND ROLES. Unit Leaders were selected by P, and the IIC formed in January. It became functional in March, with printed agendas, minutes, problems, and decisions. Study of the school log shows that a great deal of IIC attention has been paid to matters relevant to implementation: the units, parent education, study of materials, evaluation of attitudes, problems of teaming, and so on. Attendance at an IIC meeting reinforced this observation; the group functioned at a high level of cooperation and effectiveness; decisions were made on the spot, but thoughtfully, while others were deferred; the agenda was followed; easy open discussion was the rule; the principal led but did not dominate. The meetings are open to all; 2 or 3 staff teachers have attended. The IIC includes P, UL, assistant P, librarian, and district curriculum director.

P selected staff teachers for each unit, and units met during the spring. Selection was based on grade levels and on open-classroom participation. However, for next year the structure will be altered. Two units will encompass open-classroom, one will serve the "regular IGE" grades, and one will cover grades 6 and 7. There are no firm plans for multiaging; this is up for discussion and decision. Units have concerned themselves with planning, but it is not clear what this covers other than the study of math systems for possible adoption. What this means is that the units exist but for little purpose (so far). Children are not aware of the unit structure, and instruction is no different from the past. Unit teachers do meet to discuss common problems and perceptions, but except in rare instances they don't plan or teach as a team.

A unit of special teachers has been formed, with librarian as UL. Meetings have become fewer and of less moment as they discover there is little to accomplish except to pass on IIC decisions and concerns. The specials have run out of plans for next year, and in fact a rumor developed to the effect that they would not be "wanted" next year. The IIC moved to squelch said rumor at the meeting which was observed. Art and music teachers have discussed (but not pushed for) a schedule whereby they would teach units on a workshop basis, thus avoiding the class-by-class scheduling problems that are bound to arise otherwise. They would teach in a given unit for perhaps 5 half-days and then move to another unit for the same sort of workshop.

G. IGE INSTRUCTION AND SUBJECTS. None at this time. The IIC (in June) decided on math as next year's IGE subject area for the school, but no firm decision as to which program or system. Instruction now is in self-contained classrooms at the lower levels, departmentalized at upper levels.

H. RESOURCES AVAILABLE AND USE OF SAME: A League exists and there has been participation by P and UL; there have been no functions for staff teachers or others. P feels that the League is "valuable" but much more help is needed. IGE booklets were not in evidence during the visit, and several indicated that the IGE films were repetitious and unrealistic. The staff had seen 1 or 2 in the winter but not since. P has used the IDEA implementation Guide, but not religiously. A number of resources have come from the state coordinator, but since no IGE subject is operative, these have been stored away for future perusal by the staff. The state office provided a detailed guide but so far as can be determined this has been used minimally at this school.

As to inservice training, there has been little. Winter saw several films and general overview meetings, but since then inservice has been limited to what might occur during unit meetings. And not much has.

I. PARENT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION. The district has done as much as the school in respect to publications. A district letter and a Board publication have advertised the plans for the school and sought parent approval. The school held two meetings in May (projecting plans for next term), attended by about 250 parents. These were separate meetings ...one for IGE-standard and the other for open-classroom plans. In all, the Board, the district administration, and the school have conducted informational activities, but of course they have concerned mostly what is being planned for next year.

In May parents were asked to indicate (in writing) their preference for open-classroom or standard-IGE for next year. About 2/3 of replies favored the open-classroom option.

J. UNUSUAL ACTIVITIES/DECISIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION. The school's IGE log revealed the following for a 3-year implementation period:

year 1 (1971-72)...planning and preparation
year 2.....begin IGE implementation, study materials, evaluate
year 3.....individualize instruction and extend IGE

III OVERALL STATUS

K. SCHOOL ATTITUDES AND ATMOSPHERE. One gets an impression of concern with individualization in this school, though virtually all instruction is carried on in self-contained classrooms. There appears also to be an attitude of "confusion" about MUSE/IGE; that is, staff members don't comprehend (yet) what full implementation will mean. Although the MUSE structure has been organized, nothing has been begun along IGE lines, and only next fall will the implications become clear by direct involvement.

A major attitudinal factor is the potential conflict of IGE and open-classroom operations. There is a split in terms of both current planning and philosophical bent. Teachers appear favorably disposed toward individualization and useful change, but in likely quite different directions.

The teamwork attitude--at the IIC level--is noteworthy. This group was observed to be vocal, directed, cohesive, concerned, and cooperative. Units, on the other hand, have a more laizzez-faire affect; this is probably best explained by the fact that they have only general and miscellaneous planning to do rather than a precise set of goals to accomplish within the units.

L. SUMMARY STATEMENT. This school was visited only once--in May--because of the state's installation schedule. It proved to be an illuminating visit. Even though the school in some respects will not be implementing MUSE/IGE until next fall, it has an active IIC, it has chosen an IGE subject area, it has a faculty and P who are interested in individualization, the staff has been organized into units, there have been good informational activities with parents, and the administration and school Board are strongly supportive. P reported that January/February 1972 was the initiation date, and yet P's in other schools which are at about the same status indicated September 1972.

On the less encouraging side, this school has not practiced elements of the instructional programming model and in fact has just chosen the particular subject for IGE implementation next fall. The units have been formed (at teacher and student levels), but so far the teachers have had little to work toward. There is no decision yet on multiaging the units next year; even if this occurs, there seems a good chance that all instruction except that in math will be in grade-level terms. There has been lacking a sense of immediacy--"next week we begin!"--and many headaches that might have been worked through this spring have not been. This leaves a good deal of trial-and-error for the fall of 1972. Some of this is no doubt explained by the lack of a firm commitment to MUSE/IGE prior to the June vote on continuation.

The IGE-standard unit and the unit for open-classrooms have been referred to. Aside from the divisive personnel possibilities here, the division may harm IGE. One teacher wisely observed that "some standard classes are more open than the open, and vice versa;" but another teacher (who will be in an open-classroom) complained that she wants IGE math next year but won't be permitted to use it because it's structured and pre-organized around objectives for all students.

The librarian expressed an additional concern. She sees the library function as that of a full-fledged IMC; she wants kids to use the space for their needs, to have quiet and not-so-quiet places for work and study, to have all materials and equipment available for use, to have fewer "library instruction" classes and more use of the facility for work related to studies in the units. In her view, most of the staff do not share these attitudes; she anticipates a real difficulty in developing an IMC next year.

In sum, though certain MUSE/IGE implementation activities have been undertaken, it has been in terms of prepping for the 1972-73 school year. The preparation period has been long, however, and the staff appears to expect things to fall into place in September. Of the four "initiation criteria" announced by the R & D Center staff, the situation at the end of the second semester is as follows:

1. Active IIC...yes
2. Multiaging of students...no
3. Operation of IGE subject-area...no
4. Full unitization...no

M. FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS. In view of the report above, several important questions remain to be answered (next year) concerning this school's implementation.

a. Will the library be enlarged and will it become an all-purpose IMC for students' instructional needs?
b. Will teachers begin to "use" the librarian as a resource person?
c. What will come of the special teachers' plan to institute music and art workshops in the units, as opposed to weekly visits to classrooms?
d. To what extent will units be multiaged next year?
e. To what extent will instruction within units be multiaged?
f. Will open-classroom and IGE-standard begin to merge into a single cohesive staff with quite common purposes and instructional procedures?
g. Will there be a preschool workshop for the whole staff in the summer?
h. What formal inservice activities will take place?
i. How much of the instructional programming model will be operative in math?
j. How do the teams function when they get down to actual IGE planning and teaching?

N. CONCORDANCE WITH QUESTIONNAIRE DATA. The only area of disagreement is the information on unit structure. Questionnaire response indicates that children are grouped into 4 functioning multiaged units. The visit makes clear that this is true "only on paper" and that ongoing instruction in self-contained classes is not affected by the unit structure; students are not multiaged for instruction of any sort within or outside the "units."

School Number 701

I THE MILIEU

A. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND.

1. School of about 500 mostly lower-class white students. K-6.
2. District has several new and second-year MUSE/IGE schools.
3. In 1965 began multiage grouping, then some attempts at continuous progress, team teaching, and district-wide curriculum changes.
4. P feels that school has been for several years moving toward new patterns, and MUSE/IGE was a convenient and appropriate vehicle for their plans. The earlier steps were not viewed as necessary, but were deemed valuable background which provided staff readiness.
5. P learned of patterns from existing MUSE/IGE schools, visited them, and persuaded staff to visit and agree to a commitment. There was also encouragement--but not pressure--from the district office.
6. Superintendent much in favor of MUSE/IGE, but waited for formal request from school; he approved, and signed agreement with the state agency in early 1971.
7. District has both as assigned liaison and a systemwide policy committee (with representatives from all MUSE/IGE schools). It meets monthly and provides what P says is invaluable assistance since it amounts to a "local League." District personnel have participated in 4 of the 5 training chain elements, school visits, and League activities--and have assisted in the school's inservice training.

B. UNUSUAL SITUATIONS OR CONDITIONS. None.

C. TRAINING/EXPOSURE PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION.

1. Early 1970-71 visits to MUSE/IGE schools; IGE films and discussions; and commitment meeting of the staff.
2. P and teachers attended staff development workshop in spring 1971; workshop intended for P and UL, but UL not yet named. Not known whether teachers who attended became the unit leaders.
3. Preschool Workshop (3 days) held in August in conjunction with the staffs of other schools. Librarian and special teachers attended part of workshop; rest of staff (including aides) participated for the whole session. Units and IIC met for several hours.

   Agenda had been prepared weeks in advance and included films, strips, discussions, written reactions, presentations by state and district personnel, and even a glossary of 18 important terms. The program was carefully organized and well received. Several IGE film materials were used with the "discussion stops" and the participants, organized into unit groups around separate tables, discussed, raised questions, and generally made productive if only initial use of the films. Plans and reactions written by individuals and by units were collected and summarized and then reported on the following day.

   The general atmosphere was conducive to interaction and good planning. There was much discussion, excellent rapport in the units and total staff, and a high degree of enthusiasm and anticipation of a good start into both MUSE and IGE. Aside from uni* and IIC meetings and general discussion, the most valuable workshop session was probably the one on testing, scheduling, and grouping in the Wisconsin word-attack Design.

Preschool Workshop was structured yet flexible; it appeared to be a definite link in a training chain, and not the staff's first exposure. Definite attempt to develop and refine concepts as well as commitment, and not leave these to chance.

D. INITIAL STEPS IN INSTALLATION.

1. UL were named in August and IIC first met in early September. P had intended NOT to name UL and to let best leaders emerge during the fall, but then recognized that this might damage early implementation attempts. P selected UL.
2. Units were formed in August and met for the first time in early September. P chose staff teachers and organized units on several different bases: 2 teachers who had worked together previously became a unit; 4 teachers at given grade levels became a unit; one teacher did not join any unit; the remainder were organized as convenient or as possible. All units multiaged.
3. Specific weekly meetings were scheduled for units and IIC, 4 hours per week and 1 hour per week respectively.
4. Wisconsin Design for word-attack skills chosen as IGE subject for all 5 units. (Only planning steps occurred during September).
5. UL were given one set of the IGE training booklets, to pass on to unit members during the first two weeks.
6. P announced moving some decisions to units right away; this was done, and included: unit schedule, ordering supplies, assignment of teachers to particular subjects, aide's duties, IGE assessment plans.
7. P later indicated that her perception of the "beginning point of MUSE/IGE" was initiation of the Wisconsin Design (assessment of pupil status). This occurred in the early part of October.

E. PLANT.

1. Two story building, two wings, separate classrooms down the hall.
2. A number of small rooms (not classrooms), nooks, and corners.
3. Library on second floor (far away from primary children). Fairly large room, mostly books, a few A-V materials. Workroom for staff.

II OPERATIONS

F. MUSE ORGANIZATION AND ROLES.

1. UL appointed by P in August; no replacements for 1972-73.
2. IIC includes P, 5 UL, and 1 rotating teacher position (special education, staff, special subject, or the one teacher who is not a member of any unit).
3. Weekly meetings were held; printed agendas, no log or minutes. Second meeting (during Preschool Workshop) arranged to involve whole staff, who sat in circle around IIC group. Staff participated, helped in some decisions, and appeared to appreciate being included in the inner circle. Atmosphere open and meeting productive from the outset. P took role of quiet prodder, asker of good questions, smoother of feelings...although directive and forceful when necessary. Her style was to initiate, then to become unassuming.

   IIC meetings continued to be open and productive through the year, and P's good leadership qualities were observed on several occasions. P drew up agendas; other important matters always seemed to emerge.

Agendas always included routine management, but from outset substantive concerns dealt with: resource files, parent contact, preassessment, teacher responsibilities, inservice programs, best use of test results.

4. At same time, P's role was to continue to manage the school; good deal of time in office, also some teaching, and did accomplish decentralization of decision-making. Only a little classroom observation and rarely attended unit meetings. P feels teachers (and units) should do their own thing, and clearly did not interfere or pressure for given changes. Net result: some communication problems which showed up later in year. For example, P unaware of much detail about units' instructional program, waited for UL to notice or bring up problems and progress. Equally important, several staff teachers began to feel "out of it." Too much communication via UL and less direct touch with P. Felt that IIC could unite the staff more, but didn't. Units, too, were out of touch with each other by year's end. All this was not debilitating to program, but better and more communication was a need expressed; at times morale was low.
5. Of particular note: by decree, special education children mainstreamed into units from outset. Special ed teacher adamantly opposed on philosophical grounds, very vocal about the threat to kids. (His role was as resource to those children and to unit teachers). Apparently issue never came to open discussion in IIC or development of any alternatives.
6. Library staffed by less-than-halftime person, plus volunteers. Materials were primarily books and it was not an IMC in the full-resource sense.
7. Five units of varying grade-level coverage (one for grades 2-3, another for 2-5), size, number of teachers (2 to 5). One classroom stayed self-contained for whole year. Most kg's not involved in unit organization. Staff teachers appointed by P who reported this was satisfactory for first year; no plans to change unit composition for next year.
8. In September, main topic at first meeting in 3 units was "How do we work together now?" Much discussion of "my style" and some clear indications that commitment had occurred without full staff agreement or awareness of implications. However, meetings characterized by easy communication, friendliness, meaningful concrete planning.

   Later meetings attacked issues: assessment procedures for IGE subject, scheduling of special subjects (frequent concern), personal teaching preferences, how to use textbooks, etc. Examples of resolution observed: "I don't know science, but I'll take on project work and you do the real teaching." "We'll test 10 at a time, not the whole bunch." "Let's change those 2 kids; they need more active environment." Overall, units liked teammates, group planning, shared teaching, and generally held constructive meetings.
9. A definite tendency for all units to departmentalize (except for the IGE subject), even at primary level. This was never changed; thus most teachers had contact with most unit kids but with only 1 or 2 subject areas, and many children were not taught by all unit teachers. P recognized problem, said did not agree in principle but felt maybe necessary in view of particular teachers' preferences. Thus the concept of "specialization" became related to a whole subject area

instead of a resource support role for the unit. In effect, the problem was acknowledged and then ignored, with little thought to implications as new subjects became IGE subjects.

10. There was tendency for MUSE structure to follow lines of team efforts and school organization of previous years, and this had a certain weakening effect because commitments to change were not always required. At same time, units did develop cohesiveness, group planning, sharing of materials and methods--and in last analysis, most staff agreed (at year's end) that greatest impact and satisfaction was the cooperative spirit engendered and opportunity to teach together. Also distinctly felt that instruction was more structured and teachers knew what was being taught and accomplished within the whole unit.

G. IGE INSTRUCTION AND SUBJECTS.

1. Ambitious plans in September: initiate the Wisconsin word-attack program, and later move into science, math, social studies. By February P reported "maybe" to question of added IGE subjects, and by year's end there had been no formal additions. Working with word-attack as a unified program was challenge enough.
2. Classrooms observed revealed that much unit instruction was of the departmentalized self-contained sort, with little changing composition or use of strengths of several teachers. There were also excellent examples of "IGE-teaching" in non-IGE subjects. One unit had social studies for 80 kids twice a month for special topics (not startling, but would never have tried this last year). In another unit, 2 teachers were observed trading children and subjects, both teaching word-attack groups, varying the use of space and materials, both supervising study of other subjects...in a constant smooth flow of controlled activity (even though in separate classrooms on the hall). Each taught all unit kids in a given subject, but also assisted in all other subject areas...by mutual agreement of the whole team.
3. At outset, most staff knew virtually nothing about word-attack Design. Some puzzlement about "why assess?" and particularly about how to do it. District provided assistance, and units moved into assessment phase in October. Inservice meetings for whole staff focused on diagnosis and procedures. Once into instructional phase, problem was amount of time per skill. One teacher (new to reading, to managing different groups at once, and to organized instructional programing) had spent 10 sessions on "long oo" and was as defeated as as the kids. Schoolwide, they tested and regrouped every 2 weeks as a standard; this was not in conjunction with actual assessed progress or need for less time (or more). In some cases "regrouping" meant initiating a new skill with the same group (November), but later on true regrouping was the rule.

   Second major concern was finiteness of the skills, and their unrelatedness to each other or to "general reading." Some teachers distinctly turned off by the system (but not its purposes). One even resigned over the issue of fragmenting the curriculum (which she foresaw across all subjects).
4. Two units by midyear were working toward science and social studies as IGE subjects, but had little in way of systematic objectives. By yearend, all units reported word-attack as the only IGE subject. Attempts

at exploring other subjects were apparently optional within units and not in domain of IIC to control, advise, or even assist.

5. IIC reported in May that 5% of its time/effort had been devoted to monitoring the IGE implementation; larger proportions to planning inservice, general school management, planning for 1972-3.
6. All teachers taught word-attack skill groups.

H. RESOURCES AVAILABLE AND USE OF SAME.

1. Two units reported unit inservice during year (total of 1½ hours).
2. Schoolwide inservice 1 hour per month regularly, with one afternoon also scheduled. One hour was spent on a practice exercise in instructional programing; a bare beginning, and unfortunately no follow-up except what individual units might do.

   Most inservice effort expended toward "how to report word attack to parents" and a skill checksheet was devised. (Using September assessment as baseline, growth was reported in January and May in terms of number of skills mastered; also showed levels (A to D) where complete mastery had been determined). P opined in a midyear letter that there was little need for schoolwide inservice since "we handle all problems through our IIC."
3. In May, IIC reported having used 3 implementation guides through the year, but used them only as a reference tool. IIC had not set up a timetable or master plan of any sort.
4. Member of League but reported no participation in its training activities. Great reliance on district's own sub-league of schools (experienced and new), district personnel, and printed materials. Did not call on state coordinator for any sort of assistance (though coordinator did visit school and provided guidance), nor on R & D Center team.
5. P attended R & D-sponsored week of training in November; one UL attended R & D Workshop in October. Both benefited personally. P learned new respect for IIC role, but felt workshop not related to day-by-day school operations.
6. Units had average of ½ aide; job mostly instructional (tutorial--closets, corners busy much of time with this kind of work) this was true throughout the year. (Teachers rated aides in writing, made recommendations re hiring again next year).
7. Library minimally useful to school as an IGE resource. Librarian on hand parts of 2 days per week. Closed some of time. Collection of books; little in way of A-V materials, learning centers, resource files for teachers. Not an IMC in IGE sense; Plan to improve situation by increasing staff next year. Many materials kept (and used) in units in separate areas. Children were observed using library for study and reference, and they were free to come and go and to self-select.
8. Reading room attractive, well-equipped, tucked away in a corner. Not for in-and-out general use or skill-work, but reserved for "cases" who are referred for a semester. Special reading teacher. Neither she nor facility is considered part of MUSE/IGE setup; staff does not view this as a mistake or oversight.

I. PARENT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION.

1. Much of this undertaken at district level.

2. May 1971 notice to parents announcing IGE and some school changes. August letter barely mentioned the new patterns but did list units kids were assigned to and stated most kids would have 2-3 teachers.
3. September supper held with one IGE film shown. Good response noted; 250 present.
4. November notice invited interest in parent coffees to discuss general school program. One such coffee in November, one in February.
5. Openhouse (parents with kids) held in February...had always been held in February.
6. Conferences held regularly re student progress. In May, IIC discussed procedures, concluded much too much time spent on conferences; recommended fall conference (brief), and a lengthy one in spring only for "problem situations."

J. UNUSUAL ACTIVITIES/DECISIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION.

1. Total integration of special education students into the 5 units.
2. P (and IIC in effect) turning units loose to make many curricular decisions independently, and not keeping careful track of status or progress.
3. Strong relationship primarily with local group of schools, to frequent exclusion of other resources.

III OVERALL STATUS

K. SCHOOL ATMOSPHERE AND ATTITUDES.

1. By and large children observed to be happy, a little noisy, and busy, increasingly through year. Some indication of fewer discipline problems, and teachers generally felt kids were progressing academically. Also observed independence and decision-making by kids: free access to library, use of halls for study and project activities, some choices in subject areas in two units.
2. Teachers observed in May to be (generally) enthusiastic and dedicated. Not all appear to appreciate the potential benefits of MUSE/IGE, but most have responded to the challenge: acceptance of IGE programing model; notable teamwork and sharing; increasingly more flexible use of materials, space, and each other. In yearend questionnaire, majority indicated "Agreeable" as attitude toward MUSE and IGE, but only 2 indicated "Enthusiastic" for either pattern. In P's view there always were some good teachers; now there are even more. (Two teachers were vociferous in objections to the changes, and one resigned).
3. Through much of year school had atmosphere of a traditional setup; most doors closed, teacher desk in front of room, rows of seats, self-contained classroom instruction. Yet, as noted, behind those doors good things sometimes were happening along IGE lines, and apparent end result was a group of relatively happy children and relatively satisfied teachers.
4. Accompanying the above was decreasing amount of putdown of students. In the fall, much was heard like, "That group is very very slow. Tsk, Tsk," and "That one, well, can't do math but he does behave and can write."
5. Somehow (subjectively) one gets the impression that "individualization" is not the byword in this school. But there is a sense of concern about good education and the staff keeps exploring and trying. Thus,

while morale was not always at fever pitch and a sense of unity not always present, teachers did appreciate what they had learned from and about each other; did appreciate that as they kept less rigid control, children responded and seemed more active in their learning; and did appreciate the implications of the instructional programing model.

L. SUMMARY STATEMENT.

1. In spite of the beginning major problem areas (library setup, departmentalization, closed-door atmosphere, internalization of the instructional programing model, essentially self-contained classroom instruction)--this school seems to have come through the trial by fire. Its atmosphere at yearend was one of "a good place to be", it had managed to deal with word-attack skills in the IGE way pretty well, it had learned the many advantages of teamwork, decision-making had been decentralized, and commitment ran fairly high.
2. The IIC got off to a good start in planning and school management, and P exhibited notable good leadership qualities. P seemed unaware of detailed unit operations and thus perhaps put problems into a different order of importance from what others might do.
3. One can only guess that previous experience in innovations helped this staff to master the year's work. This may be worth noting since units and IIC did not begin to function until September 1971.
4. Impacts noted were: fewer bells, less regimentation, elimination of recess (and no complaints!), effective teamwork on several levels, development of a component-conscious approach to curricula, and improved ways of reporting to parents.
5. Two major problems were not solved satisfactorily: (a) scheduling the special subject teachers was a headache right up to year's end, (b) communication across the whole staff and between units (IIC communication seemed satisfactory as did operations within units).
6. MUSE and IGE implementation appear to be developed to about the same degree; both areas have "problems" which can be worked on next year.
7. Of the four "initiation criteria" announced by the R & D Center, the situation at the end of the year was as follows:
    a. Active IIC...yes
    b. Multiaging of students...yes
    c. Operation of IGE subject-area...yes
    d. Full unitization...yes/no (most Kg's not in a unit)

M. FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS.

1. Will the IIC see the value of an implementation plan and timetable and develop one?
2. Will the IIC increase the attention it gives to unit operations and to monitoring progress with the IGE subject(s)?
3. How will the reading teacher and special facility be incorporated into the MUSE/IGE school?
4. To what extent will P get more involved in the "instructional swing of things" and know the details of actual unit operations?
5. Can more inservice training be arranged for the staff?
6. Will the library staff be increased, and will an IMC develop?
7. Is there a chance that the degree of departmentalization will be reduced in the several units?
8. Will the special education situation be resolved?
9. Can some teachers emulate the IGE-teaching styles of others?
10. Will IIC begin to keep a log as a record of decisions, plans, progress, problems, and expectations?

N. CONCORDANCE WITH QUESTIONNAIRE DATA.

1. In most all respects the visits served to amplify and verify what questionnaire responses had indicated.
2. Some disparity between P and staff, however, on question of whether the staff volunteered to proceed. Staff indicated there had been some "forcing" involved, and that the implications had not been made clear enough.
3. First questionnaire indicated that a detailed letter of explanation had been sent to parents in August. Examination of the letter showed this to be a distinct overstatement.

(13.) Schools are implementing MUSE and IGE in different ways and on different schedules. As an aid in summarizing certain overall practices across schools this year, please answer each item below with a yes or no, indicating present operations and features of your school's MUSE/IGE implementation.

Detailed Questionnaire--final IIC item

	YES	NO
1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis?	✓	
(b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program?		✓
2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material?		✓
(b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers?	✓	
3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)?	✓	
(b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program?	✓	
4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?"	✓	
(b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal?	✓	
5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)?	✓	
(b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children?	✓	
6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program?	✓	
(b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches?	✓	
7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time?	✓	
(b) Is it being implemented in all the units?	✓	
(c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject?	✓	
8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching?	✓	
(b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?"	✓	
9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units?		✓
(b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit?	✓	
10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model?	✓	
(b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units?	✓	
11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure?		✓
(b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time?	✓	
12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff?	✓	
(b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school?	✓	
(c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance?	✓	

Four Most Serious Problem Areas
Noted by IIC in Detailed Questionnaire

1. Level of support/cooperation from parents.
2. Time available for planning, grouping, evaluating,
3. Nature of the building(s), layout, space; doors.
4. Scheduling special teachers (art, phys. ed, etc.) into the instructional programs of the units.

School Number 203

I THE MILIEU

A. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND.

1. K-6, suburban, middle-class school of about 575 students.
2. In previous years had "cluster teaching," some open classrooms, some teaming, some flexible grouping. P felt school close to MUSE/IGE in 1970-71 (but staff saw it as radical change for them) and thought the new patterns a way "to spur the acceptance of change."
3. P attended national meeting; committed self and school to MUSE/IGE.
4. In 1968, knocked out some walls, made some open-space areas.
5. District had a MUSE/IGE liaison, but no policy group.

B. UNUSUAL SITUATIONS OR CONDITIONS.

1. Several resource teachers in certain subject areas; each one assigned to a unit, but is not the unit leader. Roles not clear, confusion with unit-leader concept and with their supposed availability to all units in school. This creates a special opportunity in the school but also creates special problems. Resource teachers receive extra $ compensation but unit leaders do not.

C. TRAINING AND EXPOSURE PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION.

1. April: IGE filmstrips and books; some discussion and viewing.
2. June: special reading teacher to R & D Center for training in word-attack Design.
3. Local commitment meeting for the staff.
4. Unit leaders, P and resource teachers to state-sponsored training for principals and unit leaders, in the spring of 1971.
5. Preschool Workshop, 2-3 days, late August, with prepared agenda. Consisted of staff meetings, IIC and unit meetings, 3 hours with a consultant on Wisconsin word-attack Design. Otherwise, little training or discussion. No purposes or projected outcomes apparent. Full staff attended the total workshop with the exception of aides. (Staff impressions later were that this was most inadequate preparation).

D. INITIAL STEPS IN INSTALLATION.

1. P chose reading and math as IGE subject areas.
2. UL selected by P, in May. IIC began to meet in September.
3. Preschool Workshop gave considerable attention to new teachers, but very little in terms of MUSE/IGE plans or operations.
4. P indicated that "selection of unit leaders" was the event which signaled initiation of MUSE/IGE. That had occurred in May.

E. NATURE OF PLANT.

1. Two floors. Several open-space areas, housing two whole units and parts of two others. Many separate classrooms. A number of alcoves corners, etc. Small, centrally-located library.

II OPERATIONS

F. MUSE ORGANIZATION AND ROLES.

1. P selected UL and staff teachers. No changes in UL for 1972-73.

2. IIC set up and began to function in September. At beginning of year consisted of P and UL plus librarian; by May, included 1 Kg teacher, 1 Learning Disabilities teacher, and 1 other. Reading specialist not a member (though felt she should be).

   Agendas appeared more like notes and announcements, and were not regularly issued. Considerable emotion among UL about their roles; felt they were seldom consulted on substantive matters, and that IIC was just a way of passing announcements to the staff. "I'm just a reporter," said one. The May questionnaire contained this footnote on the IIC instrument: "We don't make decisions." Attendance at meetings and examination of agendas showed no change through the year; a late October agenda listed a review up to that time, with no provision for discussion, problems, decisions. December meeting concerned with policies for visitors and parent volunteers; and a later one with school rules for children. Two notes of interest were contained in a winter agenda: "We want a list of all students reading below grade level" and "All Wisconsin Design materials will be kept in my office. Some manuals are still missing."

   Apparently IIC did not meet on regular schedule; often P met with full staff or with separate units. Typically, all types of meetings were P-dominated and provided little opportunity for distribution of decision-making.

3. Six units; by year's end each still was named (by P) by using the last name of UL. At outset Kg not included in any way, but by spring a few primary children spent part-time in Kg, and there was talk of moving some in the <u>other</u> direction next year.

4. A slow change concerning multiaging. At outset, multiaging only in the one IGE subject, and rest of instruction was pretty much single-aged in self-contained areas; by May, much instruction was multiaged in all subjects. But the self-contained feature was maintained in 4 of 6 units. Two units used open-space for continuous grouping, team teaching, shared resources--but others had not learned how to do much more than plan together. Much reluctance and insecurity observed in re teamwork, with growth evident in planning process and use of materials.

5. Units had 1 hour daily for meeting. In the fall, typical that they met less frequently if had "nothing substantive" to deal with. No agendas in evidence during year. Two meetings observed in November were totally concerned with teacher frustration and dissatisfaction. In both primary and upper levels there was later evidence of better use of time and some effective leadership in working with IGE subject. But by and large, unit meetings which were attended became gripe sessions with the visitor cast in the counseling role.

G. <u>IGE INSTRUCTION AND IGE SUBJECTS.</u>

1. Preassessment in word-attack Design completed end of October; grouping began in November in 4 units. (Other two had math or vague individualization in language arts). Memo from P in November listed staff assignments (in word-attack) to skill areas and groups of students; advised

them that first go would be for 3 weeks. By May such decisions were made mostly in units, although with considerable input from P; recycling still done on standard 3-week basis. One primary unit ended up assessing by "feel" rather than by testing.

2. In spring, one grade (part of a unit) tested students in Wisconsin study skills program, and other units were to follow, on a grade-level basis, as announced.

3. It was difficult to "see" IGE at work in visits, except rarely in the word-attack program. There was scattered evidence of assessment, grouping, etc.; but as noted by IIC in May, the school was not following the instructional programing model.

H. RESOURCES AVAILABLE AND USE OF SAME.

1. Special resource teachers in language arts, science, social studies, math. Roles and benefits unclear.
2. Two units had aides; other 4 had access to resource teachers.
3. Library small, although contained much more than books. Attitudes of librarian were very positive and she hoped for increased space and opportunity to be more valuable to instructional program. Students moved in and out freely, as observed; made good use of what was available. In addition, small rooms for tutoring and projects in social studies and science, though not under direction of librarian.
4. Little or no schoolwide inservice training after Preschool Workshop, and virtually no use of consultants; what inservice there was was planned by P. One unit of 6 reported its own inservice (ten hours), and a group met on voluntary basis with district leader to study writing of behavioral objectives.
5. P,/UL, and resource teachers attended League training activities.
6. One implementation guide used, but only as a reference source.
7. Staff made no visits to other MUSE/IGE schools, which are fairly near. P made one visit. ("Our principal is the only one who knows what's going on on the Outside!"
8. P reported no direct contacts to state coordinator for assistance of any kind, though coordinator made 2 or 3 general visits to the school.

I. PARENT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION.

1. First push at end of October. P prepared long letter, sent it home by way of children in November; it gave some mention to IIC, units, and individualizing...and included an eloquent defense of multiage grouping. November open house, with special periods for questions and answers. An April meeting for interested parents, to explain the workings of the Wisconsin word-attack Design (April 1972).

J. UNUSUAL ACTIVITIES/DECISIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION. None.

III OVERALL STATUS

K. SCHOOL ATMOSPHERE AND ATTITUDES.

1. As implied above, many teachers were none too happy about the introduction of patterns they had virtually nothing to say about. Felt P had pushed it on them, as other P's previously had done; much mention of P's needing to have an innovation for the year, and reference to change for change's sake. Sample comment (staff and unit leaders)

included:

"Principal doesn't listen to us or care about our frustrations, but tells us how busy he is." "Many decisions were made without our input about getting into this." "Training? What training?" "How can you justify changing curriculum offerings and programs every year without giving the previous one a chance?"

2. Children moved freely and appeared generally happy and productive. Little regimentation evident.
3. Teachers did not appear very knowledgeable about classic models of MUSE and IGE, although on the whole they liked IGE better than MUSE. Some feeling that IGE might be good for the kids if done properly, but MUSE was not good for them!
4. P enthusiastic and committed. In fall he felt "everything's going along well," though this was contrary to staff sentiment. By mid-year he noted that teachers were beginning to plan together, which was in itself worthy of note. In detailed questionnaire, he reckoned that 60% of staff were Agreeable to the MUSE/IGE patterns, and none were Enthusiastic. He was right--(based on attitudes expressed by 17 teachers at the same time).

L. SUMMARY STATEMENT.

1. From the outset, and through the year EVERYONE (P, teachers, visitors) noted lack of communication in the staff. Morale was consistently and pervasively at a low level. P was apparently gung-ho, but did not assess (or respect?) staff feelings or concerns.
2. Plans for 1972-73 include IGE programing in 3 subject areas across all six units. IGE, by May, had only begun to work effectively in 3 or 4 units, in one subject-area.
3. Some growth was observed over the year in unit planning and sharing, in teaching multiaged groups as a regular thing, and in the implementation of the IGE design in word-attack.
4. Resources within the school are not articulated with each other or the IGE purposes; resources outside the school are seldom called upon.
5. The last page of the May IIC questionnaire (attached here) will be particularly illuminating in examining this as a case-study school. Of 26 criteria considered reasonable to ask about, the IIC indicated that fewer than one-third were operative by year's end.
6. Overall, IGE appears to have gained a stronger place in this school than MUSE, although both were at a fairly low level.
7. Year-end status, in terms of the four "initiation criteria" stated by the R & D Center, appeared to be:
    a. Active IIC....No
    b. Multiaging of students....Yes
    c. Operation of IGE subject-area....Yes/No
    d. Full unitization....No

M. FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS.

1. Will inservice become a regular feature of the school program?
2. What steps can/will be taken to improve intrastaff communication?
3. Will the instructional programing model be uniformly implemented across units, in one subject-area?
4. When and how will the IIC begin to function as a decision-making body? Will clearer roles for the UL be evident?

5. Will units continue to develop teamwork skills, and transfer these to teaching as well as planning?
6. Will the principal return next year?
7. What sorts of training and exposure will be provided for staff teachers?
8. Does enlargement of the library and its "IMC program" become a reality?

N. CONCORDANCE WITH QUESTIONNAIRE DATA.

1. Except for items indicated below, questionnaire and visit data matched up very well. There were conflicting reports, however, as to whether or not the P attended Staff Development training session.
2. P reported in survey instrument that "staff considered the new patterns and volunteered" to proceed. Visits with many staff members made this seem an exaggerated statement.
3. P reported in survey instrument that a spring meeting (1971) with parents was the only vehicle for contacting and informing them. Visits revealed that in addition there were the long letter, the open house, and the few small meetings in the fall.

(13.) Schools are implementing MUSE and IGE in different ways and on different schedules. As an aid in summarizing certain overall practices across schools this year, please answer each item below with a yes or no, indicating present operations and features of your school's MUSE/IGE implementation.

Detailed Questionnaire--final IIC item

	YES	NO
1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis?.....	✓	
(b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program?.....		✓
2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material?.....		✓
(b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers?.....		✓
3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)?.....		✓
(b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program?.....	✓	
4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?".....		✓
(b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal?...		✓
5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)?.....	✓	
(b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children?.....	✓	
6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program?.....		✓
(b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches?.....		
7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time?.....	✓	
(b) Is it being implemented in all the units?.....		✓
(c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject?.....		✓
8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching?.....		✓
(b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?".....		✓
9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units?.....	✓	
(b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit?.....		✓
10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model?.....	✓	
(b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units?.....		✓
11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure?.....		✓
(b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time?.....		✓
12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff?.....		✓
(b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school?.....	✓	
(c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance?.....		✓

Four Most Serious Problem Areas
Noted by IIC in Detailed Questionnaire

1. Grouping students for instruction
2. Overall school schedules and separate unit schedules.
3. Roles and responsibilites of aides.
4. Nature of the building(s), layout, space; doors.

School Number 403

I THE MILIEU

A. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND.

1. School of 700 students, suburban to large city, K-6 coverage.
2. Only MUSE/IGE school in district; chosen to be pilot school.
3. Began innovative elements in 1968; by 1970-71 P saw it as already a MUSE/IGE school in principle and in fact.
4. School far enough along in its involvement to have (a) printed (by September 1971) an extensive PR booklet, outlining MUSE and IGE elements, naming the IMC, listing UL, and providing a schedule; and (b) made extensive structural changes in the building prior to school's opening in September.
5. District has strong curriculum committee, which in effect serves the district policy function re MUSE/IGE in the one school.
6. 1970-71 multiunit approach used in primary level; little individualizing but teams formed and operated as units with UL.
7. IIC set up in June, began functioning then; school's own timetable prepared in August; P and UL training in July; staff awareness and committment meeting; Wisconsin word-attack chosen as IGE special subject in July. All these factors suggest early and firm planning at the school level.
8. P became aware of MUSE/IGE and chance to "join" through attendance at a college-sponsored introductory meeting.
9. District has definite inservice schedule, and has devoted summer work to development of objectives and outlines in reading and math. Both activities relevant to events in this school.

B. UNUSUAL SITUATIONS OR CONDITIONS.

1. On semi-formal basis, this school was a MUSE school in 1970-71, with IIC, units at primary level, and beginning of IMC. Written reactions were studied, decisions made over summer, and policy enunciated for 1971-72 as a result. Clearly, the school had a headstart in implementing MUSE if not IGE. Formal district and school commitment took place July 1971.

C. TRAINING/EXPOSURE PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION.

1. 1970-71 P and teachers visited 4 existing MUSE/IGE schools.
2. Staff viewed IGE films and strips; all attended college-sponsored conferences in 1970-71.
3. Staff participated in 1-day local commitment/awareness session.
4. P and UL attended staff development (state-sponsored) July 1971. (P rated as "good" and felt UL were especially helped). Noted that program did not include time for school's IIC to meet and plan as a group.
5. Preschool Workshop held 2 days in September. Total staff attended whole workshop. Workshop agenda had 4 emphases: IIC meeting, general staff meeting, introduction to Wisconsin word-attack design, lengthy team meetings. More a planning session than one devoted to training.

   Much time spent discussing previous year's reactions, and how IIC in summer had made policy on many such matters. These included: team assignments, children's options, use of materials, "rules" for unit and IIC meetings, visit policies, use of open space areas, etc.

At IIC meeting, UL reminded P of other important matters to be taken to full staff meeting; UL did not act like novices to their roles in the IIC or units.

Primary units (with experience last year) moved smoothly through planning, scheduling, teaching assignments, parent communications, etc. Good leadership and open communication; productive meetings. One unit got into detailed planning of science instructional unit.

At intermediate levels lack of experience showed; spent most time planning activities for first two days of school--in detail--and seemed quite unsure of their roles and where the units were headed. Open communication, but weak understanding of the priorities (made a big deal, for example, of arranging chairs in the open space rooms). All units worked out "team groundrules."

D. INITIAL STEPS IN INSTALLATION.
1. UL and team members named in June. IIC met in June.
2. Decision to use Wisconsin word-attack as IGE subject; math secondary.
3. Building altered to suit MUSE needs.
4. IIC and units developed groundrules for roles, meetings, purposes.
5. Rules for children (vis-a-vis open space, new programs).
6. Handbooks for teachers and students developed. Careful explanation of new setup, expectations, schedules, etc. For teachers, detailed outlines of unit roles and responsibilities as well as options; included checklist for team and inter-team relationships (the latter a problem from previous year). For students, a notice about wearing school buttons (!) and an open invitation to use the IMC freely at all times.
7. P indicated later that he could not specify what constituted the "beginning point of MUSE/IGE" since "we were operating under similar ideas and organization for one year. MUSE/IGE was a convenient vehicle for meeting other interested people."
8. Decided that all teachers in a unit would teach all subject areas.

E. PLANT.
1. A circular building with classrooms ringing perimeter. Rooms grouped by units, and half-walls between rooms; thus partly open space arrangement. Full walls between units. On one floor; mostly carpeted. Common areas in center of building.
2. Library and IMC joined; tiered amphitheatre area; much storage space for materials; workrooms. Large well-stocked facility. Fairly central to all six unit areas.
3. Above represents results of remodeling in summer 1971 from self-contained classrooms and closed-door library.

II OPERATIONS

F. MUSE ORGANIZATION AND ROLES.
1. IIC composed of P, 6 UL, UL of special subjects, IMC director. All meetings open to staff teachers; some attend.
2. Late spring 1971 teachers named 3 others wished to team with, also named choice for UL. Based on resulting sociogram, P selected UL and team composition; virtually all satisfied with outcome. Same UL for 1972-73.

3. Several inter-team meetings held: to avoid misinformation, generate consistency and unity.
4. IIC agenda announced to all by daily bulletin. Usually 4 or 5 items. No IIC minutes kept. Much that is decided is spread by word of mouth; records on inservice, aides' roles, IIC plans, etc., nonexistent.
5. IIC developed timetable (August); feel they are on schedule.
6. IIC reports 60% time on school management, 5% for monitoring IGE, and none for aiding units in instructional programing.
7. IIC meetings characterized by effective leadership by P, give-and-take, productive use of time, participation by all. Lack of log makes it hard to know what actions were taken; many topics were discussed but not resolved, while on others decisions were made. No particular growth was noted, since from outset IIC was cohesive group, P was receptive, UL appeared to understand their roles, and decision-making decentralized.

   Topics of moment included: moving kids from primary to intermediate units for fall 1972; inservice (quality, amount, need for); instructional materials needed for science; resource committees to work in the summer; previewing of training films; unit goals.

   Daily bulletin also had separate notes to units, written by P and not necessarily product of IIC. This included announcing interteam meetings (3 intermediate teams or 3 primary teams).
8. Within units, kids selected own homeroom teacher (few exceptions); usually siblings in same unit to facilitate records and conferences.
9. Units organized in semi-open space areas. By midyear and May visits, a good deal of instruction carried out by teams of teachers and aides working together with varied groups of kids, whether or not with IGE subjects. Areas were noisy, but controlled and organized. The team approach was not new this year for most teachers, and not only did they plan and decide together, they taught together.
10. Units decided which subject a teacher would specialize in; she would lead (science, e.g.) and others would assist. Group planning necessary, therefore, in all subjects. Tendency for this to break down, and the "lead" teacher would do most of the work alone by year's end. Still, all teachers in all units taught all subject areas to some extent; and taught at least 50% of unit's students. For IGE subjects (math or word-attack) teachers did plan together regularly.
11. One problem in units--where kids were used to more free-wheeling approach--was presentation of music as a structured "classroom subject" for a defined period of time. Disruption. Problem not solved during 1971-72. Another problem also not solved was scheduling enough unit planning time.
12. The library/IMC was large, well-stocked, and staffed (fulltime, part-time, and volunteers). Centrally located. Open shelves, learning centers, A-V devices, materials, etc. Plan and reality was that it be an always-available learning resource, open to free-flow use by students and teachers. Library with separate reading-study area. Dozens of children observed in and out, using materials responsibly. IMC director in tune with IGE philosophy.
13. Units have 2 hours/week for planning as a team.

14. Units structured to include these grade groups: K-3, K-3, 1-4, 4-6, 4-6, 5-6.

G. IGE INSTRUCTION AND IGE SUBJECTS.

1. Apparently little or no individualization last year; taking on Wisconsin word-attack (primary units) and math (intermediate units) was pretty new to all concerned. Used their own math "system" this year.
2. In word-attack in particular, groups of various sizes were taught, with changing composition as kids tested out of skills. Observed different modes (or at least emphases) of instruction, and this seemed typical.
3. In reading and math (and other subjects, too) permanent problem was lack of varied materials. Using "same old texts and workbooks" and apparently not $ enough to purchase extensive new materials. Nonetheless, a definite effect (by May) of transferring to social studies and science, for example, the "IGE approaches" used in math or word-attack (some assessment, pacing, small group instruction, various materials).
4. In November, units still struggling with assessment techniques. Not happy with their procedures. By year's end, units following instructional programing model in word-attack (primary); not able to do so as well with math (intermediate) because "system" was not complete. However, one unit did report regrouping (spring) in terms of assessed progress in math.
5. Detailed record forms developed for math and word-attack.

H. RESOURCES AVAILABLE AND USE OF SAME.

1. P called on state coordinator for training materials and assistance with IGE subject. Visits to other MUSE/IGE schools made in fall 1971. Very little mention of League activities, though P did attend one League training session. P, UL, 1 special teacher, and reading teacher attended an R & D Center-sponsored 1-week unit leader training workshop in October. Reading teacher attended R & D reading workshop. Mutual support sessions with staffs of 1 or 2 other MUSE/IGE schools.
2. R & D Implementation guide used, as resource and checklist for progress. Various training materials (films, booklets) reported to have been used; such materials were not used during Preschool Workshop.
3. IMC open to kids and teachers as instructional resource. Special reading teacher for "problem cases"; apparently teacher incorporated into MUSE/IGE only to small extent.
4. Unit inservice is not the rule. Three units reported 1 hour (for whole year), one 2½ hours, and three reported none. IGE films and strips were used at times.
5. Schoolwide inservice took place several times, in one case for 2 days, another for 1 day, also an hour or two. The first session (November) involved viewing of filmstrips and "Tuesday" film; unit solving of problems posed in film. Then UL reported their recent UL training (goal setting and student assessment in the unit). Followed by 2 hours of unit meeting to work out assessment of UNIT accomplishment against criteria in the R & D implementation guide. Many teachers criticized filmstrips for their unrealistic parts, but also acknowledged that seeing them a second time "they made more sense." State coordinator was observer and participant at meeting.

Another inservice day included IGE films, team work on math and reading procedures, and development of IGE-type instructional units in science and social studies.

Sessions dovetailed into district's own inservice schedule so that purposes of non-gradedness, continuous progress, etc., could be dealt with and IGE materials could be used. District required 4 full days. While staff reported benefit at time of the training, LATER both the IIC and whole staff had severe criticism of the inservice). At formal meetings it developed that "inservice took too much time", "wasted time", "just makes the school year that much longer", "benefits were minimal." Real fuss apparently was over extra time involved rather than lack of assistance or direction provided.

6. There are no aides in units; student teachers regularly involved.

I. PARENT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION.

1. Staff felt parent contact had been weak in 1970-71.
2. Units sent separate letters to parents in August, explaining changes, schedule, units, individualization, and other items.
3. Each unit set up ½ hour (or 1 hour) per week, at a specified time, when parents might call in with questions. Continued through year.
4. October letter to parents from P, general info, announcing opportunity for tutoring and special help in language arts areas. Also in October, P sent brief questionnaire to parents asking about reactions, indications of benefit to the child up to then, etc. Not known how much response.
5. Various coffees and general PTA programs, no special efforts to sell MUSE/IGE. However, one unit had a morning program on reading where parents sat with their kids for instruction; 75 parents.

J. UNUSUAL ACTIVITIES/DECISIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION.

1. Teachers (in writing, interviews, and meetings) indicated the value they placed on custodians and cooks as members of the instructional team. Urged more use of them, recognition to them, and some training.
2. Plans laid in February and finalized by May to pay teachers for a series of planning and writing sessions in summer 1972. Develop instructional materials in science, social studies, reading; also objectives. Hope is to get these as close to IGE system as they got math last summer.

III OVERALL STATUS

K. SCHOOL ATMOSPHERE AND ATTITUDES.

1. Visitors and teachers alike credit P with ability to develop cohesiveness and unity in staff, to help things move smoothly, to encourage independence on part of staff and kids. Spirit of mutual trust.
2. P reports that some teachers resist the UL role, but these are few and seem to resist most change. Negative feelings far outweighed by positive. Even so, P's estimate of staff attitude toward MUSE and IGE was: 60% enthusiastic toward MUSE, 30% agreeable; and 35% enthusiastic toward IGE and 45% agreeable. These were borne out by individual staff responses. Apparently much enthusiasm toward individualization, continuous progress, teamwork, etc., but not necessarily in MUSE and IGE terms.

3. Staff in general seemed comfortable in IIC and units and staff meetings--participated, criticized, worked together for "better school." They feel a part of problems and decisions and it is "their school."
4. Special mention by staff of positive feeling toward multiaging: its benefits to kids; their own new learnings about broad curriculum.
5. Children evidence positive feelings on the whole; like having several teachers and chance to use IMC as needed. Multiaging works from kids' point of view.
6. School atmosphere and staff/kids' attitudes did not appear to change through the year; stationary at quite high level of enthusiasm. Building and facilities no doubt contribute.
7. Negative feelings expressed re length of school day, time pressure to do the job, too much inservice, etc., but even so, MOST would not want to return to self-contained classroom.

L. SUMMARY STATEMENT.

1. Not surprisingly--in view of past experience here--school seemed from outset to be setting a high standard in implementation of MUSE and IGE. IIC functions well, spirits are high, units plan and teach together very well, grouping of units was done by their preferences, IGE has succeeded in word-attack and is progressing in math, IGE-ness has extended into the teaching of other subjects, and IMC is an exemplary instructional center.
2. Problems repeatedly mentioned were lack of planning time and shortage of teaching materials; by year-end there were no clear indications that either problem could/would be solved for next year.
3. There were no aides, but many student teachers. Thus support staff was available. Reading teacher; IMC director; special subject teachers.
4. Seems this school called on other resources less than many; probably because it had done so last year; and as a whole, staff feels quite confident. They do use an implementation guide for more than reference.
5. Impacts noted were improved student behavior, P's use of MUSE/IGE factors in recruiting and evaluating teachers, and a highly organized educational program as compared to 1969-70 and earlier (for both staff and students).
6. MUSE and IGE appear to be developed to about the same degree; that is, both have been implemented quite well. There are a few problems to iron out, but by and large it would appear that this school could proceed fairly independently from this point on. Dedicated staff helps here, as does what appears to be the clear vision of P in directing the implementation.
7. Of the four "initiation criteria" listed by the R & D Center, the situation at year's end was:
    a. Active IIC...yes
    b. Multiaging of students...yes
    c. Operation of IGE subject-area...yes
    d. Full unitization...yes

M. FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS.

1. Will the summer efforts result in usable instructional systems in other subject areas...or might they turn to published materials?
2. Can the units help the music teacher to have greater success, perhaps by unstructuring the music curriculum somewhat?

3. Will the IIC begin to keep minutes, records, and other written materials for reference re decisions, problems, progress, etc.?
4. Can more planning time be arranged for units?
5. How will money be found to increase the supply of instructional materials for all subjects?
6. Does math evolve into a true "IGE subject" next year?
7. What sort of training will be provided for new teachers?
8. Will this school's "model" status (and success) result in local extension of MUSE/IGE? If so, will a district policy group be formed?

N. CONCORDANCE WITH QUESTIONNAIRE DATA.

1. Visit findings verified and amplified questionnaire responses.

(13.) Schools are implementing MUSE and IGE in different ways and on different schedules. As an aid in summarizing certain overall practices across schools this year, please answer each item below with a yes or no, indicating present operations and features of your school's MUSE/IGE implementation.

Detailed Questionnaire--final IIC item

	YES	NO
1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis?	✓	
(b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program?	✓	
2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material?	✓	
(b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers?	✓	
3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)?	✓	
(b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program?	✓	✓
4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?"	✓	
(b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal?	✓	
5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)?	✓	
(b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children?	✓	
6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program?		✓
(b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches?	✓	
7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time?	✓	
(b) Is it being implemented in all the units?	✓	
(c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject?	✓	
8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching?	✓	
(b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?"	✓	
9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units?	✓	
(b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit?	✓	
10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model?	✓	
(b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units?	✓	
11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure?	✓	
(b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time?	✓	
12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff?	✓	
(b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school?	✓	
(c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance?	✓	

Four Most Serious Problem Areas
Noted by IIC in Detailed Questionnaire

1. Keeping records and recording student progress for IGE.
2. Level of support/cooperation from district personnel.
3. Time available for planning, grouping, evaluating, & preparation--in the units.
4. Supply of large variety of teaching materials.

Additional Observations on Visit Schools

Brief commentaries are provided below on several additional schools, chosen because of the unusual nature of their problems, progress, or circumstances. All but one of these installed in the fall of 1971, and thus findings from more than one visit were referred to. One school installing in the second semester is included; only one visit was made, at the end of the year, and this yielded a most unusual approach to MUSE/IGE implementation.

School Number 201. A K-4 school, 400 students, middle-class, in rural area near large city. Had been traditional in 1970-71 except for a special program aimed at learning disability cases in the district. Program centered in this school, and apparently it was the catalyst for MUSE/IGE to be taken on. Energy, effort, and enthusiasm were high throughout year, but more of it aimed at the learning disability program, and thus MUSE/IGE took a back seat. For example, although unit and IIC meetings were generally productive, although much effort went into behavioral objectives, though morale was high--the 3 units at year's end were at very different stages in (a) IGE programing with Wisconsin Design, (b) use of the team concept in teaching, and (c) development and use of the unit's "personal" IMC. (No central IMC, although a traditional library existed).

School Number 302. A K-7 school, 600 students, middle-class, suburban. In prior years had been remodeled into several open-areas, but was example of a "change without a purpose." Finally MUSE/IGE came along to fill the void! Excellent team teaching was observed at year's end, along with good examples of instructional programing, at the primary levels; considerable growth was noted during the year. However, at upper levels MUSE/IGE never really got a start; multiaging was inimical to staff preferences, and it was difficult for P to budge the curriculum. A history here of staff discontent and frustration, and P did little to alleviate the situation. Most of staff (even the effective UL and teachers) stated flatly that P had made all decisions, that IIC does not meet regularly and never has agendas, that he manages the school at a distance which generates resentment and lack of loyalty.

An added deterrent was lack of imagination on part of P and librarian as to how the large, well-stocked, carpeted, well-staffed library and media centers could be used. Nothing about them was observed to be put at the service of IGE, and thus, in effect, no IMC existed.

School Number 101. A K-6 school, 400 students, middle-class, small town. Had "experimented with" differentiated staffing, multiaging, and team teaching. P and staff had excellent relationship; children appeared at door of P and their problems were solved on the spot; morale was high throughout the year. Major areas of growth and change were: (a) P suggested, and staff agreed to, a New Year's gift of doorways between rooms, carpets, and enlarged library/IMC. These changes were made. (b) IMC director grew in receptivity to children's using the facility freely and helped teachers to grow in using the resources fully. (c) IGE programing in Wisconsin Design got better and better in 3 of 4 units. Resulted in confidence which led to serious development of math program for next year, with much mature concern about objectives, materials, etc. (d) MUSE structure developed easily, under P's leadership (gentle, quiet, committed).

Teachers typically "used" visitors as consultants, generally had good questions and real problems. Teamwork at a high level on the whole; in fact, units regularly kept minutes as well as agendas, and the files make an interesting overview of problems, solutions, plans.

Things are not perfect. Teachers feel somewhat isolated and need much help in making a go of what they're committed to; units operate fairly independently and not always in harmony. One sad scene observed: as the visitor talked with a teacher whose class was busy at many things, through the new archway into the next room he could see that a bookcase had been erected. The two teachers are apparently not in communication except for the IGE subject. Here is an archway that has made each more tense because it suggests that they should be working together.

School Number 914. K-6 school, 500 students, suburban middle and lower class. Old buildings, 3 floors, strictly traditional up to January 1972 when formal installation began. There is no library, staff had neither a

Preschool Workshop nor Staff Development training, and the supply of instructional materials is low. HOWEVER, the IIC functions well, in-service has been initiated, the units are teams in a very full sense, and the prognosis for instructional programing is excellent. What is notable here is that once committed, the staff pressed P into having a trial run with IGE in the spring. Units developed objectives (all in the same subject), materials were gathered, and multiage instruction based on various amounts of assessment took place for 3 weeks. Unit meetings in June were still devoted to isolating problems, working on solutions, planning for "real" implementation in the fall. The staff has wisely begun several activities which probably means they won't be overwhelmed in September. P noted that the staff's insistence on a dry run (born of apprehension, no doubt) had made all the difference, and felt realistically confident about the IGE-ness of their future program.

School Number 602. K-4 school, over 1000 students, lower class and rural. Had been traditional in virtually every sense up to 1971-72. And it appears to remain that way. P reports that MUSE elements exist and that IGE is "in," but staff contradict him at every turn. The IIC meets only occasionally (true throughout the year), and units meet to solve problems of particular kids or use of space. But instruction is single-graded and carried on in self-contained atmosphere and reality. Seems that P did not consult staff on proceeding, or assess their reactions, preferences, commitment. The prognosis is poor at this school. Little training took place. Student body and faculty seem so large as to inhibit a sense of unity. District does not appear to know what to do to help. Most important, P seems to be deceiving himself about what is actually happening in the classrooms and about the level of resistance to change. There are some instances of teamwork, and of moving children within the unit after staff discussion, and evidences of attempts to individualize (for brighter students), but these are few.

School Number 502. K-6 school, 450 students, center city, mostly lower SES, all blacks. P's attitude is that "We are in the center city but we are not of it. This is no deprived school and we work hard here for good education for these kids." Staff and student morale observed at

fairly high level through the year; IIC meetings were productive, well-run, and fun; units did not function nearly as well, however. It is a busy school, with open-door policy at the P's office, many nooks and crannies used for tutoring, a tremendous number of Teacher Corps aides and interns. In fact, TC is not new here, and it is the genesis of much of the educational program; MUSE/IGE is something of a step-child, though the IIC element has been adopted and made good use of.

There is much inservice training; but since it comprises courses, not all staff have been involved, and not all courses relate to MUSE/IGE. In all of this, IGE instructional programing has lagged way behind, though P is pushing for its "real" implementation next year. He opined that this year is a gear-up year and acknowledged that TC and the courses have drained energy away from IGE. Learning Centers, in addition to library, provide much opportunity to kids to work on their own or with TC tutors...(the potential for an IMC is here)...these Centers grew in importance during the year. There is also a high degree of visible and latent staff commitment, and the prognosis for MUSE/IGE is good.

School Number 702. K-6 school, small city, middle-class, about 200 kids. Old building, 3 floors; had been traditional in its outlook and programs. One walk into this educational enterprise convinces you that anything can work--given a perceptive P, a dedicated staff, and materials. Many changes were made in the building to develop an IMC; actually, learning centers and study areas are located virtually everywhere, and in three visits it seemed that every closet, nook, hallway, library area, etc., was being used responsibly by kids off "on assignment" from their unit rooms. A-V materials, kits, books, listening corners, globes, projectors...they seem to be everywhere and everywhere in use.

There is only a semblance of an IIC, and units do not meet weekly. Both circumstances were explained away by fact of small staff and continuous communication and planning in the halls, at lunch, after school. P and UL did not attend staff-development training, but there was a Preschool Workshop. All teachers reported improved staff cooperation, unity of objectives for the school, effective team and unit functioning.

And all agreed that there is a marked difference among the kids: they're learning and loving it...and this seemed as true in May as in October. MUSE has developed quite well, and individualization in 2 subjects is accomplished via multiage instruction to constantly changing groups based on periodic assessment. They seem to know what they're doing in this school, but would be hard pressed to explain just what it is or why it works.

School Number 501. K-6, small city, mostly lower-class, about 750 pupils, separate classrooms, small library, strictly traditional in the past. District has strong inservice program and evaluation of schools' progress, and by year-end made decision to shorten school day in order to permit more planning time. UL was IIC chairman til March when P took over. All units on Wisconsin Design; "specialist" from each unit meet together weekly to plan, revise plans, oversee WD; multiage WD instruction but otherwise grade-level self-contained. School has 2 atmospheres: P and many teachers are open to ideas, children, change; other group of teachers are quite resistant and librarian similarly conservative. School suffered morale downslide from high level in fall to a general aura of frustration and non-communication in May.

School Number 301. K-4, rural area near large city, about 700 students, middle-class. Mostly open-pods, which surround the IMC. Pods are versatile though some are used more as separate classrooms. IMC is large, well-stocked, imaginatively constructed, well-staffed, well-used. It is central both geographically and instructionally, and represents "the best." In 1971-72 there were 8 units; reorganization will reduce to 4 units so that, as P says, "units will have to meet as units; this year they were so small they never worked out group procedures." P has developed careful job descriptions for UL, aides, staff teachers. Eight committees formed (parents and teachers) as main way to involve and inform parents; has worked quite well; printed objectives for each committee and deadline for reports and outcomes; includes committees on philosophy, music, PR, reading, reporting procedures, movies, inservice. Good examples of older and younger teachers working together: teaching, not just planning. P is forceful, effective, forward-looking...and demanding. Prognosis for this school (with its building, its P, its units, its IMC, its coterie of staff teachers, its district support)...good to very good.

Findings Across All Visit Schools

Inservice Training

The training design had called for at least ½ day of inservice in the fall and the same in the spring, after the formal training chain itself had been culminated in the Preschool Workshop. Among the total body of schools, this plan could not be followed. Some had no inservice training and others had a total of several days, varying also in the nature of the participants as well as sponsorship. Variations included: a few teachers, whole staff, a unit alone, aides, whole staff except aides or special subject teachers, staffs of more than one school. Sponsors were sometimes the district, the school alone, a League, or a university; and in some cases inservice constituted a credit or noncredit course.

While many schools had formal scheduled inservice training at various times, it was possible to attend such sessions in only 10 of the 25 schools on the visit roster; five states were represented. Training events observed varied in length from 50 minutes to a 7-hour day.

Typically more than one topic was treated. Topics included the following (with frequency noted):

-teaching styles (flexibility).....1
-classroom management in unit.....1
-planning for IGE in general.....2
-general staff meeting problems.....2
-unit operations; teamwork.....3
-materials for IGE subject-area.....2
-planning for second IGE subject.....2
-practice instructional program model.....2
-develop objectives.....3
-general teaching tips.....1

Procedures employed for accomplishing purposes were most frequently general discussion, viewing films and filmstrips, formal lecture, study of materials and tests, and small group discussion. Brainstorming, panel presentation, and using a quiz as basis of discussion were represented twice each. In one case a simulation was initiated; however, only 50 minutes was given to the exercise of choosing an instructional topic, working out objectives, selecting materials, and suggesting teaching styles. After 20 minutes, enthusiasm for the task waned and unfortunately there was no follow-up. In another instance of working directly on the IGE programing model, there was considerably more success (in defining specific objectives); that session was part of a ten-hour "course."

There were no observed instances of role-playing; demonstrations; or workshops directed to the development of specific products.

About half the sessions had written agendas and specific objectives; in only 2 cases did the plan include evaluation of the training event. Aside from the use of IGE films, training sessions typically did not make use of supporting materials such as outlines, A-V equipment, lists, or chalkboards, nor were careful minutes kept. Moreover, in 3 locations the training took place in workspaces which were not conducive to participation, writing, or easy viewing.

As to participation, most events included the total staff; one event was for aides only; many times aides and special subject teachers were not included; and in 2 cases each inservice took place only within units or for a subgroup of interested teachers. State coordinators were present at 4 of these sessions, as were various district personnel and consultants (observing or conducting training).

Products or outcomes were usually fairly intangible: attitude change, intentions to make materials or regroup the children, a list of topics to consider later, or (in most cases) nothing perceptible at the time. One unit altered its schedule and set up learning centers as apparent results of work with a consultant, 1 school ordered teaching materials, and 1 attempted to alter the IIC organization. The most impressive outcome was the most intangible: attitude change on the part of 3 unit teachers after discussing openly their teaching styles and recognizing their formal approach (in connection with an IGE filmstrip).

Those sessions observed were typified, overall, by lack of a defined, expected product which could be applied, tried, or checked on; often the purposes and activities were multiple and diffuse ("general") where an attempt to zero in on one specific manageable problem might have been more appropriate. Listening, as opposed to participation and working together, was the major activity of participants. Planners sometimes concluded that the time allotments were too short (though sometimes there was no option) and that assistance was needed from outside the school (again, not always available). In short, it can be concluded on the basis of observed inservice training that more and better planning is a real need and that "inservice" is defined in many different ways.

Many teachers and others felt that the inservice training was of value (and generally approved the use of films and filmstrips), most frequently because it came after 2 or 3 months of work in time to refresh their perceptions and to call on their recent experiences. It is also noted that there were some excellently planned sessions which moved toward their goals, and that the two unit-level events were especially productive.

General Features Among Visit Schools

The case studies and brief commentaries above reveal a number of practices and circumstances common among the schools visited--and also some which were distinctly individual. Using report material from all schools, the following observations may be made; these relate only to the schools which were visited. To be sure, detailed questionnaire responses from the remainder suggest that one might infer much the same range of similarities and differences, and also one might expect other unique practices or outcomes to emerge.

1. Across the visit schools, it was the more common practice for principals and unit leaders to remain somewhat separate by year's end. Principals frequently addressed agendas "To the IIC" "From the Principal," thus noting his identity as principal and not as a co-member of the IIC. Typically, unit leaders reinforced this "separation," though in a few cases the IIC appeared to function and consider itself as a committee of equals.

2. Related to this, there was a continuing concern with communication between principal and staff, even in schools where MUSE and IGE progressed fairly smoothly. Teachers in many cases felt cut off from the principal, with unit leaders in some cases reluctantly becoming the go-betweens. Some principals (and IIC's) sought to solve the problem (staff meetings, principal attending unit meetings, notices, parties, etc.), while others were at a loss for solutions to try. The general effect of all this was that the situation improved by year's end.

3. An almost universal concern at all levels was the lack of inter-unit communication on personal, professional, IGE, or general school matters. The feeling was that MUSE (potentially) could be a divisive force, and this was fought against.

4. Many IIC's grew through the year, as observed, in handling more substantive matters, in developing assurance in their roles, and in managing the instructional program. Even so, it was typical that the IIC spent a good deal of its effort in running the school rather than monitoring or aiding in the IGE instructional process.

5. By and large there were few really top-notch IMC's. In a few schools there was not a library; in some there was only a library; and in others which had more or better facilities, there was not always staff to match (either too few or too rigid). In exceptional cases the school itself became an IMC, with children and teachers freely using all available instructional materials. Librarians and IMC directors were frequently frustrated by not being consulted, not being members of the IIC, or not having facilities or materials needed even for one IGE subject. As noted in the case studies and commentaries, in several schools the situation improved during the year.

6. There was no common mode of relating special education students to the unit structure. Practices varied from no adjustments, to partial inclusions, to complete mainstreaming. None of these appeared satisfactory, and schools were confused as to how to handle the philosophical as well as psychological issues.

7. Similarly with the kindergarten. In most schools it remained separate, although several began to integrate students into the primary units toward the end of the year. The common practice was separatism, but the common attitude was uncertainty.

8. Generally speaking, schoolwide inservice left something to be desired. If it wasn't the planning and objectives and materials, it was the lack of full staff participation. On the other hand, in the few instances where unit inservice was observed, the outcomes appeared to be more beneficial and lasting.

9. The principal, in virtually all schools, was the driving force behind MUSE/IGE adoption. In some schools the staff was more than ready to find a way to better organize their past efforts, and in others they were either reluctant, hesitant, or (in a few instances) downright hostile.

In all cases, the principal appeared to carry the ball, sometimes after a planned play and sometimes by means of a surprise end run. Not all staffs could join the game. Thus there was a wide spectrum of morale and morale problems, as the case studies make clear. Many staffs developed better plays as they also developed confidence and received assistance, while a few never managed to get beyond the 5-yard line through the whole year.

10. It is difficult to say whether MUSE or IGE emerged ahead of the other on the whole. But each had its show. In some schools, by design, IGE was promoted and it developed along lines of the instructional programing model, while the MUSE organization followed behind. In others, the opposite was the case. Clearly, though, there was no pattern by which the two marched hand in hand through the year and continued to help the other to develop.

11. It was fortunately not the common practice to try to initiate MUSE/IGE and some other innovation. Where this happened, there were predictable problems. The great majority of visit schools tried to develop MUSE to some extent, and most (but not all) began at least to work with one IGE subject. Several schools attempted to go IGE in 2 or even 3 subject-areas, and found this more difficult than anticipated. The pattern was to fairly well accomplish IGE programing in one subject during the year.

12. On that subject, there was general difficulty in internalizing the instructional programing model in all its related parts. Staffs, on the whole, did not receive sufficient training or background--perhaps "practice"--and very frequently were uncomfortable with the model and its implications.

13. What staffs generally did accomplish, and appreciate, was team-work. A great many units consistently reported the benefits of working together and learning from one another, and quite a few principals indicated that their one goal for the year was to guide the accomplishment of just that. There was some grumbling about teammates and unit leaders, but again, on the whole the attitude was positive toward the concepts and realities of unit structure. This was more frequently evidenced in planning and sharing and deciding together than in teaching together; as noted, even in units with "good feeling", much instruction was carried on in self-contained classrooms and with self-contained attitudes.

14. A recurring and almost universal bugaboo was scheduling, as noted by personnel at all levels. A few schools worked out the problems, but most still suffered at year's end with confusion and frustration, in unit and school. However, there was improvement noted where an IGE subject was implemented at a fairly high competency level; to make it work, scheduling problems had to be resolved.

15. The Wisconsin Design for word-attack in reading was most frequently employed as the IGE subject. It was recognized as a prototype and vehicle...for accomplishing the teaching of the skills and also for representing the related aspects of the IGE instructional model.

16. There was fairly shallow use of the film and print training materials, at least as observed. They were frequently used at a minimal level, or distributed without much build-up. On the other hand, a number of teachers felt they were valuable; only a few thought the films valuable enough to view a second time, however.

17. The District--with its testing schedule, requirements for report cards or conferences, salary limits, curriculum guides and so on--was frequently seen as a deterring factor to implementation. Sometimes the problem was lack of district support. While there were exceptions, generally the view was that the district could have helped more.

18. A very frequent observation was that staff teachers were not exposed to as much training as were the school leaders. Staff teachers are not easy to relieve from classroom duties, of course, and that is also a problem. Generally, training before school opened, opportunities after school began, activities of the linkage groups, and special training--these were directed to principals, unit leaders, and many reading specialists. A parallel observation--though not expressed quite as often--was that many principals and unit leaders did not feel equal to the task of training or guiding staff teachers. A great need existed for expertise from the outside.

19. An encouraging number of structural changes were made in schools before or during the year, and others were planned for summer 1972. As noted, however, some of these were ignored by teachers too bent on the traditional modes of instruction.

20. Few schools set up detailed implementation schedules. For the most part they had vague plans which seldom were changed or updated in writing. Similarly, few schools made detailed use of the implementation guides. This is puzzling, given the attitudes and expectations of most principals and many unit leaders in these schools; perhaps they were overly optimistic at the outset, and as they groped with ensuing problems they did not attempt to see the whole of MUSE/IGE in perspective again.

21. Overall, there was an attitude of commitment to the MUSE/IGE concepts and changes. Along with this, there developed through the year a growing recognition that implementation would no doubt take 2 or 3 years. Thus what might have been an overwhelming sense of frustration or discouragement developed only infrequently, and the more common attitude was to work over the summer and start in again in the fall. But it should be said that these positive reactions and attitudes did not characterize the staffs of all visit schools; a few (perhaps 2 or 3) appeared by year's end to be candidates for a return to the old ways, the old days.

Relationships between Visit Findings and Questionnaire Data

The visits served their initial purpose, to verify (in great measure) what had been reported in the questionnaires from these schools. On the whole, the training experiences reported were verified during interviews and by study of records; and the reported implementation steps were in general matched by the visit observations.

However, there were a few important differences noted. A number of schools, for example, reported that multiaging was the rule in the units, but several visits made it clear that this meant either (a) multiaging of units existed on paper, or (b) multiaged instruction was restricted to the IGE subject-area.

Questionnaire reports from a few schools indicated that staffs had had opportunity to study the innovations and had agreed to proceed in 1971-72; again, visits made it abundantly clear that, in these few cases, staff members held a different view. They felt they had been forced into the decision by the principal and were not committed to MUSE/IGE practices. Across all schools, visits yielded a sense of atmosphere and attitude which could not be derived by a questionnaire approach.

In 2 or 3 cases, interviews and observations clarified the questionnaire data on the activeness of the IIC; it was learned that the IIC seldom met or dealt with only perfunctory matters, and this was contrary to the impression gained from questionnaire responses.

Another major area was also clarified. While many of the visit schools reported a number of schoolwide inservice hours on various topics, several interviews showed that the reported times included faculty meetings or inservice for only part of the staff or what might better be called "general discussion." In any event, inservice was a term that took on many meanings and the problem here was more likely one of definition.

Visits also clarified to some extent attendance reported at various segments of the training chain. Some confusion about the identifying terms used in the questionnaire had been anticipated; and indeed several principals reported attendance (at Staff-Development Training or national meetings or special workshops) which later turned out to be other sorts of training. There were relatively few cases of this sort, but enough to give pause about the original questionnaire reports.

Finally, as to the degree of unitization, visits provided some input. Where several schools had indicated full unitization, interviews and observation revealed that kindergartens were not included, or that all special education children were not involved, or that one grade level was not unitized. Many of the visit schools, in the survey instrument, reported such variations; in those cases where variations existed and were not so indicated, it appeared to be mostly a matter of definition and interpretation.

The Real Issue: Spirit and Commitment

What has been discussed above is primarily a matter of fact. But there is also an impressionistic domain. To omit it or deemphasize it would be to strip the visit function of some of its importance and potential. What needs to be said is that implementation is as much a spiritual matter as a set of given decisions or events. More precisely, this relates to the apparent success of implementation and the prognosis for continued progress.

Whatever this spiritual or qualitative factor is, some schools have it and some just don't. Whether it is commitment to children's education,

or outstanding leadership, or perceptive grasp of MUSE/IGE concepts and potentials, or a mood of optimism--or all of these--we cannot tell. It is all the more elusive because it does not appear to be directly related to particular implementation plans, training, activities, or events.

For example, three visit schools in particular did not have all the basic elements of implementation (training chain, IIC, full unitization, library/IMC, or careful instructional programing)...and yet they emanated an atmosphere of active learning, concern for children, devotion, free use of materials, creativity, and a sense of "where they were headed."

An equal number appeared to have followed the criteria in a "letter of the law" sense, but lacked a sense of commitment, mutual trust, careful planning, and open access to education. In these cases, the prognosis was not good, and the more perceptive staff members recognized this.

And of course a few had both the prescribed implementation elements and the necessary spirit, and appeared to have done most of the right things to put the patterns into operation, to involve parents, and to set up a systematic as well as humanistic educational program. All the more notable, since two schools in this category had moved from a strictly traditional approach to the new MUSE and IGE patterns.

Several schools were in a state of in-between, but optimistic. They had instituted many of the prescribed changes, and had a partial share of the necessary spirit and commitment, and seemed to be on the right road.

A few other schools also had instituted the changes and had some of the spirit...but somehow did not stay on the path. Perhaps there were too many problems to cope with, or a lack of optimism, or a failure to internalize the end-points toward which they had begun moving.

To an extent, the sentiments above amount to a ranking of the schools in terms of general progress in implementing MUSE/IGE in the first year. It would probably be more appropriate to think of these five levels as predictive of further progress than as any sort of absolute scale of year-end success. In any case, they are tentative and are bound up with subjective impressions.

CHAPTER VII

INSTALLATION MODELS AND DESIGNS

Introduction

While the emphasis in this process evaluation has been on the school level--implementation procedures, involvement in training, feedback to planners--the framework in which the installation process took place should also be examined. Implementation at the school level, after all, was the result of a number of planned activities at national and state levels. The attempt was made to become and stay acquainted with these activities during the year, more in the sense of an inquiry than a formal accounting. Thus, no instruments or standard procedures were involved. Data on the original plans, the necessary changes, and the ensuing means of fulfilling them were derived from several sources:

(a) "Request for Proposal" -- U. S. Office of Education

(b) Wisconsin R & D Center's formal proposal and various progress reports to USOE

(c) Interviews with R & D Center staff and state coordinators

(d) Informal reports, mailings, newsletters, lists, etc., provided by the R & D Center, state coordinators, and a few Leagues

(e) Attendance at several state, League, and national training sessions, and at two meetings of the network of state coordinators

The overall installation plan, as instituted and promoted by the R & D Center staff, consisted of four somewhat overlapping designs or models. These were (a) the training chain of five basic elements, inservice training, and special workshops, (b) the formal installation model involving agreements with states and localities, (c) the implementation design at the school level composed of many specific criteria, and (d) the instructional programing model for IGE subject-areas. These were overlapping in the sense that some of the training occurred after school installation had begun and became a part of the implementation strategy; that the school-level criteria included the instructional model; and that fulfillment of the several designs depended upon interaction of R & D personnel, state coordinators, and district and school personnel.

Training Design

This design consisted of five elements in a training chain, as follows:

Introductory national overview conference
State conference for district and state commitment
Overview and commitment conference at school level
Staff development workshop for principals, unit leaders
Preschool workshop for entire school staff

There was no absolute standard requirement for participation in these sessions, but it was anticipated that states and districts would be involved in the first two; districts and schools in the third and fifth; and schools in the fourth. However, state coordinators were expected to arrange the Staff Development workshop and to require each school to have the Preschool Workshop. The R & D Center planned to conduct the national conferences and assist in the state-level commitment meetings.

A second aspect was the scheduled schoolwide inservice training at the school level, during the year. As much as possible was encouraged, but coordinators were expected to insure two 1-day (or four ½-day) inservice sessions in each school specifically devoted to MUSE/IGE topics.

The third aspect was the provision, by and through the R & D Center, of particular workshops. Plans included a "national seminar" in June, to include the state coordinators; various workshops in reading, at the Center in Madison, for reading consultants, state coordinators, and others; several workshops for experienced principals and unit leaders, to be conducted by either the Center or particular universities, and to be held during summer 1971 and the 1971-72 school year.

Within this training framework, the intent was to acquaint and train state personnel, superintendents, and coordinators so that they--in conjunction with certain college staffs and consultants--might pass on to other district personnel and to principals and unit leaders the implementation plans and strategies related specifically to MUSE and IGE. The school leaders in turn--with continued assistance from district and state personnel--were to be responsible for training the complete school staffs. Training was not defined in consistently specific terms, although the Center did prepare a number of sample agendas (for the Local Commitment meeting, Staff Development training, and Preschool Workshop) and did provide access to various training materials. It was apparently assumed that in all or most cases, considerable reliance would be placed upon the IGE films, filmstrip-cassettes, and booklets developed by I/D/E/A.

Formal Installation Model

The R & D Center began planning and operations in the spring of 1971. These activities included organizing staff and resources, conducting the national awareness conferences, selecting states and districts to be involved in the nationwide installation, developing training sequences and training content, and otherwise preparing for the program. Particular efforts were made in reference to the state departments of education which would carry out the program during the 1971-72 school year.

The regulation model called for agreements between the Center and the State Department of Education, outlining the financial, educative, and coordinating functions of each party. Agreements were essentially the same for each state, and in particular called for the employment of a state coordinator, development of a state installation plan, completion of a minimal training series, use of inservice materials, and development of plans related to the 1972-73 school year. The Agreement spelled out certain responsibilities of the state coordinator but did not provide a job description of the coordinator's role; it also called for a small number of specific reports to the Center and participation by the coordinator in certain training sessions. The Center on its part agreed to subsidize the coordinator's expenses, develop a national installation network, conduct various training sessions, provide access to training materials, and consult with states and districts as feasible.

A similar agreement was proposed between the state and the school district, naming mutual responsibilities and particularly calling on the district to designate a liaison, provide funds for inservice and other training, and otherwise monitor the implementation of MUSE and ICE in the local school(s).

The model included few actual "controls" over activities at state and local levels, except as noted above; many areas were left to more local discretion and responsibility. This included the nature of the Agreement between state and district, for which the Center provided a prototype contract. As can be seen, the formal installation model and the training design overlapped considerably.

Outlines of the Agreements are contained in Appendix I.

Implementation Design at the School Level

This broke into two pieces. The first was the set of activities agreed upon (for the school) by the district in a formal agreement with the state. Included were such individual school tasks as: assessment of teacher attitude, opportunity to transfer; Preschool Workshop, 2 days of inservice training; and "implementation of a minimal standard" in organizing elements of the MUSE structure and IGE instructional programing, as well as a planned program of parent communication.

The second aspect was a set of explicitly outlined behavioral objectives prepared by the Center. These included preparation for commitment, elements of MUSE organization, IGE programing, relationships with the district, parent communication, and inservice training. (Greatest attention was given to MUSE and IGE components). In their original form, the separate criteria were labeled important, desirable, or essential, and were related to "first-year operation." In revised form (in the fall of 1971), the labels were omitted, it was stated that "all or most" of the practices were important, and it was implied that the criteria applied to a longer period than only first-year activities.

Instructional Programing Model

Although this was included, in effect, within the behavioral objectives referred to just above, the model was frequently treated as a separate entity because it outlined in specific detail the procedure proposed for teaching in terms of IGE. Morover, it was possible for a school to install the MUSE structure without following the instructional design. The model included these steps:

-statement of broad educational objectives
-determination of which objectives were attainable by given segments of student population
-assessment of achievement levels, learning styles, and motivational levels of population segments
-statement of specific behavioral objectives for each child
-planning and implementing of suitable instructional program, with attention to grouping, group sizes, media, facilities, time, and learning styles
-reassessment for attainment of objectives
-EITHER define new objectives for student and proceed as above, or reassess suitability of objectives and repeat former program

The implementation guide of I/D/E/A was used (or also used) by many schools; its version of the instructional programing model was virtually the same as the R & D Center's, though phrased somewhat differently.

Findings

In an effort to minimize ambiguity and repetition, findings are presented separately for the four models and designs. However, many of the particular activities and outcomes overlapped considerably among the four areas, and some cross-referencing will be necessary.

Training Design

First, in connection with the training chain of five elements, five national awareness conferences were conducted during the spring under R & D Center sponsorship. The intention was to inform potential state and district personnel, and then to encourage commitment to the 1971-72 installation program. From the spring months and into the fall, such commitments were made, and the Center included as "implementation agencies" nine state departments of education, one county system (California), one large city (Lincoln, Nebraska), and one smaller district in Virginia.

As noted in Chapters III and IV, state/district commitment conferences were held, though many districts were not represented. These were sponsored by the implementation agency itself. On several occasions, R & D Center staff assisted.

Similarly, a great many local awareness/commitment meetings were conducted for purposes of informing the staff, developing MUSE/IGE concepts, securing the school's commitment, and beginning the planning process. Many districts did not appear to have had such meetings, and those which did were free to develop their own purposes and procedures.

As to Staff Development training for principals and unit leaders, the R & D Center reported having sponsored and managed several of these during the late spring and summer months, in conjunction with the state coordinators (and the city and county coordinators). Such efforts continued into the fall in two or three states, in order to (a) prepare staffs for second-semester installation or to (b) improve on earlier efforts which had apparently not

proven satisfactory. Three other states conducted their Staff Development training in conjunction with I/D/E/A and/or universities during the same general period, although in two of these instances R & D staff were present as consultants for the reading design.

Preschool Workshops were the responsibility of state coordinators and local schools. As noted in Chapter III, a number of schools did not conduct these sessions, for whatever reason. However, they typically were held in most schools and in all states. The record shows that R & D installation team personnel assisted in many of these local Workshops far and wide.

It is obvious that the "training chain" notion did not succeed in the sense that each district and/or school staff participated in all elements; it is also quite true that in spite of consistent training in the chain, many school leaders did not feel adequately prepared to pass the training on to their staffs. In order to solve the problems inherent in those two statements, the Center staff made itself available--on call--to states, districts, and local schools, and participated in or directed dozens of "extra" training sessions. Some of these overlapped into the school's own inservice training and into League training functions, but many were conducted for several schools together or for selected staff. In effect, there were opportunities for principals and unit leaders (and some school staffs) to get continued training and exposure, although apparently this was not automatic. Schools had to seek such assistance via the state coordinator.

Also, the installation team made numerous school visits (on a sampling basis in several states) in order to gain their own feedback on operations during the year; inevitably, such visits constituted training and consulting assistance. Thus, in addition to those formal training chain elements in which the Center was directly involved, the Center staff was responsive to special requests and went out on troubleshooting missions as well. In order to accomplish this, the installation team was supplemented by a group of school practitioners (from Wisconsin) who were specially prepared for the role.

Second, as to inservice training, Chapters III and V refer to the great variation in amount and content at the school level, and report, too, that in many cases inservice training was not directed to the whole staff. A number of schools simply did not have (or could not afford) inservice; where it was held, it appears that there was no vehicle at the national or state

level for requiring it or monitoring its quality. And there proved to be a few schools which had minimal participation in the training chain and on top of that had little or no inservice training. As noted above, R & D Center consultants assisted in many inservice programs, if requested.

Third, several special workshops were sponsored by the Center. These included weeklong sessions for reading teachers and others on the word-attack Design, held principally in the summer. Several weeklong sessions were held for principals and for unit leaders during the fall and winter of 1971-72 as refresher courses in MUSE/IGE and for redefinition of the school leaders' roles. Most of these were contracted to other universities and the Center reported little input into the programs; two were held at the Center itself. These workshops were a responsibility of the Center under its contract, and were interpreted as an opportunity for school people. They were in no sense required and were not part of the formal training chain.

Formal Installation Model

Agreements were consummated with nine states, one county system, and two more local districts. Thus in most cases the state department of education became the MUSE/IGE implementation agency. By this means the particular schools were also signed up since the implementation agency then effected agreements with school districts.

The Center installation staff was in constant touch with coordinators by mail and phone. But more important, direct contact was arranged through visits to the states and through formal meetings for coordinators held in Madison. The latter occurred in July, October, February, and July (1971-72) and included such matters as use of materials, contractual requirements, development of a national network of implementation agencies, management of training endeavors, and so on. While much of substance was discussed and decided at these meetings, and participants stood to gain a good deal from each other, it should be noted that not all coordinators attended each of these meetings.

It was learned that not all coordinators spent fulltime in that role, perforce, and that they had developed quite different ways of operating within their states. A few maintained contact with their schools through regular visit schedules and regular mailings of numerous explanatory and supportive materials of all kinds. Most made special efforts to develop

Leagues within the state or regions of the state, and these were active and effective to differing degrees. A few apparently did not feel completely comfortable in directing inservice activities personally, though all were responsive to a degree to schools' requests for materials, consulting, and other sorts of assistance.

It was also learned that at least by the end of the school year, while there were several stated responsibilities still there was no single job description for the coordinator's role. In the latter respect, the implication was that coordinators might exercise differing degrees of control or assistance to schools, and indeed this was the case. Some were more forceful and/or imaginative than others, and thus interpreted their functions in terms of school outcomes and progress rather than in terms of the provision of materials or opportunities. Some were more insistent on representation at training activities and the use of implementation guidelines, for example.

In particular, it was observed that various training materials and implementation criteria were provided to the coordinators by the Center, but that coordinators were then free to use or recommend them as they saw fit. Thus, while some duplicated many such materials and forwarded them to schools, others did not...and, in either case, there were few attempts made to monitor the use of the materials or guidelines. All of these variations, of course, must be interpreted in terms of the shakedown nature of the first year efforts and the fact that coordinators were of necessity developing their own roles during the year. But all of this raised a question, often asked, about the nature of control and authority in the installation with respect to the Center and coordinators on one hand, and the coordinators and schools on the other. Getting systematic or regular feedback or monitoring progress and use of materials did not appear to characterize the first year efforts at any level. Similarly, there were widely differing timetables in effecting the training chain, beginning the installation process, developing linkage groups, providing consultation, and visiting schools. As might be expected when the directives were few, coordinators developed different lists of priorities. At the same time, of course, they had different lists of problems to solve in their own states, too.

Because of some of the above, it was found expedient to interpret the Agreements a little less rigidly than might have been done. For example, the Center originally required the coordinator to visit all schools for a certain length of time and on a schedule; as it was found that coordinators were not all fulltime or had too many schools to handle, "visiting schools"

came to include maintaining some sort of regular contact. In this sense, the installation model itself was developmental and changes in original plans were made necessary during the first year.

Implementation Design at the School Level

With respect to both aspects of the local design--(a) provisions made by the district and (b) actual steps taken within the school--much has already been reported in previous chapters. Districts did not uniformly require that teachers' willingness be assessed; they did not all assign local liaisons; nor did they all provide the means for inservice training (or even the Preschool Workshop). Many districts did follow the rubrics of the Agreement, to be sure, and monitored individual school progress. But this was not standard any more than it was standard for the schools to follow the R & D Center's precise implementation criteria.

As noted, these criteria (behavioral objectives) were suggested as important to a good outcome, but they were not presented as a set of absolute requirements. (Moreover, not all schools received these volumes through the state coordinator or other means). Equally important, the criteria were not outlined in a sequenced format or priority listing in such a way as to constitute explicit expectations for accomplishment after half a year or a year, for example. They represented an overall view of the end-point of installation after perhaps 2 or 3 years; thus, individual schools began at different points and implemented different sets of specific criteria.

An additional consideration is that some schools employed the implementation criteria published by I/D/E/A, and the two sets were notably different in scope as well as specifics.

In an effort to clarify the matters alluded to above, the Center staff in February announced a list of four basic criteria by which coordinators could judge the initial status of their schools. These four objectives have been discussed in Chapters III and V, and it was seen that not all schools had accomplished those requirements by mid-year or by year's end.

Instructional Programing Model

As with the whole matter of implementation at the school level, the IGE programing model was employed and followed to widely differing degrees. The specific steps appeared to be fairly well known, but while some schools

enjoyed particular success, many others had particular difficulty with assessment, or grouping, or accommodating to different learning styles. This model, of the four discussed in this chapter, appears not to be amenable to revision. It represents a culmination of many efforts in the field to codify a sequenced approach to learning that is both flexible and structured. As such, it is presumably expected that it must be followed to the letter in order to be effective; if that is the case, the findings from various parts of this study suggest that a considerable amount of training and practice are required in the 1971-72 schools before the model is implemented satisfactorily.

Chapter VIII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Because the preceding chapters reported findings based on different procedures carried out at different times, each one has included interpretation of those findings along with a number of conclusions. Chapters III and IV dealt with survey findings across all schools and districts essentially at midyear; Chapter V reported detailed installation procedures in a sample of schools at the end of the school year; Chapter VI's main purpose was to discuss the observations made during site visits through the year; and Chapter VII dealt with findings from a variety of sources, related to the four major designs and models in the overall installation project. The discussion and conclusions presented in each chapter were limited to the appropriate procedures and populations.

The attempt here is to draw from all those sources, whether overlapping or separate, and to arrive at conclusions which (a) assist in the evaluation of the nationwide installation process as well as the school-level implementation of MUSE/IGE elements, (b) provide broadly-stated feedback concerning 1971-72 practices and outcomes, and (c) suggest particular recommendations for future practice.

In spite of the different procedures and populations involved in acquiring data, there is a temptation to generalize to the whole installation operation. The conclusions below admittedly represent a distillation of the whole range of findings and interpretations, and in fact do constitute an act of generalization.

So far as school-level operations are concerned, for example, whole staffs in approximately 50 schools (in eight states) were polled as to their year's-end practices, problems, and attitudes; and half of these schools were visited at least once during the year. The emphasis in the conclusions is on those end-of-year and site-visit findings. But no attempt is made to state that the findings and conclusions based on those data apply to the total group of 287 schools on the original rosters. However, the number of implementation variations, outcomes, and unique features among those schools leaves little doubt that the same (or larger) range of differences probably applies to the total group.

In other words, we do not generalize particular findings, but we hypothesize a like array of differences and similarities among all schools. This is borne out in part by examination of the survey findings from earlier in the year--though to be sure, we recognize the importance of the time difference and the likelihood that many schools had altered a number of practices by year's end. In this respect, the site-visits are also important. They show several fairly distinct patterns of status and change through the year, and again--though we would not generalize those patterns or their frequencies to the total group--we would hazard the guess that such patterns were frequently repeated.

The same approach appears appropriate with respect to the operation of the several installation designs and models. Enough was learned from a variety of sources to justify certain general conclusions about their effectiveness, their potential, and their variable implementations. The conclusions are based on the available findings, and do not represent statements of fact applicable in all cases.

Many conclusions (and related recommendations in several cases) may appear to be "negative" in substance. This was no doubt anticipated, however, since from the outset the installation process was recognized as a first attempt at extensive application of the two related innovations. There were, in fact, quite a few departures from the proposed designs and models, and certain conclusions relate to that fact. It was no doubt expected, too, that a number of installation aspects (at various levels) would be found in need of alteration or revision through the year. The attempt is made here to state conclusions which reflect the findings, and to propose a number of constructive changes or additions in the form of recommendations, as appropriate.

In addition, the topics discussed in this chapter may (a) confirm various findings made by the R & D Center staff and the several state coordinators; (b) give emphasis to certain problem-areas or progress-areas which emerged as vital components from the whole installation project; (c) underscore the need for specific change in either content or emphasis in the installation designs and models; (d) reflect general status and processes in the nationwide project; and (e) suggest particular areas where further exploration or study would be valuable at either national or state levels.

Conclusions

Conclusions are framed in the present tense, representing observations and summary statements as of the end of the 1971-72 school year.

School Implementation Success

1. It is next to impossible to judge implementation success at the school level unless only a few precise criteria are applied. Even when this is done, the outcome is not satisfactory because two other areas--difficult to measure--appear to be almost equally important: (a) the local milieu and needs and circumstances which must be considered as the ground in which the innovations are planted, and (b) the level of staff commitment, along with general spirit and humanistic atmosphere, which provide nurture for the budding innovations.

2. Thus it appears more appropriate to talk of implementation progress or to prognosticate concerning future status. In those terms, it is concluded that between 200 and 225 schools made changes in their organizational instructional patterns which could properly label them as emerging MUSE/IGE schools. It is recognized, however, that those figures include schools at widely different stages of implementation and varying levels of commitment; and additionally, that a few appear so weak as to raise a question about their future participation.

3. So far as apparent outcomes are concerned, there were few meaningful differences between the fall and spring groups of schools (within or between states). It appears that where fall schools (as a group) may have had a time advantage in moving toward the implementation criteria, the spring schools countered by having used the fall period for more careful planning and preparation. The net result is that the variation within groups was about the same. The conclusion is drawn that it simply may not matter whether installation occurs in the fall or spring semester, there being advantages to each season.

4. MUSE/IGE can be successfully begun and can make meaningful progress in a variety of settings: in traditional school buildings, including those of two or three floors; in center-city areas, suburbs, large and small towns, and in rural regions; in schools with essentially middle-class or lower-class populations; in schools with less than optimum libraries or instructional resources; in small and medium-sized schools (up to perhaps 800 students).

Application of the Models and Designs

5. The nationwide installation has been successful in organizing several state efforts and in initiating MUSE/IGE patterns at the local school level. The four models and designs involved have been adequate to get the job started and to assist a majority of schools in maintaining their momentum.

6. At the same time, the installation process--with its models and designs-- has itself been developmental at all levels. The R & D Center, the state coordinators, districts, schools, and even units have been "finding their way" and discovering what procedures work best; as a result many different versions have emerged. Though the four models and designs were originally firm, three of them were administered flexibly as needs and circumstances became apparent during the year. Thus it may also be concluded that the Wisconsin R & D Center staff and the state coordinators as a group were sensitive to many such needs and responded to a number of them; similarly, some districts and many principals were aware and responsive within their own domains.

7. Inservice training--being so diverse and sometimes undefined and often not made use of--cannot be assumed to be an integral part of the training design, though this would be desirable. It appears that inservice training needs to be consistently defined, required, and monitored before it can be properly viewed as a part of the design.

8. It is concluded that, overall, the formal training plans were well-conceived, but that certain controls were not present to guarantee equal or even minimal access to training (or to tne whole range of resources). Thus, training was often insufficient for perceived needs (for example, staff teachers required more training and exposure; principals and unit leaders needed more/better preparation in order to become the trainers in their schools; schools, rather than individuals, were the recipients of training).

9. The state implementation agency is not the major variable in school progress. Each state demonstrably has "strong" and "weak" schools, and there appears to be no one state agency which stands out as close to the ideal. Moreover, there is no example of a "pure installation" at the state level, since in each state there were related state, district, or school practices which antedated the MUSE/IGE installation (including various ties with the I/D/E/A group as well as cohorts of 1970-71 MUSE/IGE schools).

10. The installation model is not practiced consistently across the several states, in spite of identical (or nearly so) written Agreements between the states and the R & D Center. This appears to be not only because of differing sets of problems, needs, and perceptions across the states, but also because the Agreements left many matters to the discretion of the states (including definition of the state coordinator's role).

11. Written agreements between the state and the district do not suffice. Too many districts apparently did not understand certain implications of the arrangement, and thus did not fulfill all their obligations. As a result, some schools joined in which were themselves simply not ready or which did not later receive support from the district system.

12. Regarding implementation status, and monitoring of the same, it is not enough to know that schools have an IIC or an IGE subject or a set of multiaged units. Each such major component itself has subcriteria which define it and its relationship to other components. Morover, the subcriteria are the real substance, and all conditions must be satisfied before status or progress can properly be credited.

13. It is difficult for a school to implement the necessary subcriteria of even the most basic objectives, in the first year. Few schools did so. A related conclusion is that it was appropriate for the R & D Center to change the time-span represented in the published criteria, from one year to three or four years for satisfactory fulfillment. Reality was served, and schools were in effect notified that they were dealing with successive approximation as a mode in place of absolute adoption of defined changes within one year.

14. It is concluded that something is lacking in the implementation guidelines (criteria, or behavioral objectives). The majority of school and district personnel used the guides mostly as a reference source, and some made no use of them. The greatest apparent lack was sequenced steps presented in priority order for first-year implementation, with checkpoints included. As it was, practitioners were often overwhelmed by the sheer number of criteria and the local options they had in selecting where to begin.

15. The instructional programing model is difficult to implement, even though it is the "tightest" of the four models and designs. Its sequenced steps are precise but demanding, and apparently the difficulty lay in the

number of radical changes from traditional classroom procedure. Teachers by and large accepted and handled it conceptually, but encountered much difficulty in applying it systematically, even when the curriculum used was one developed along the model's lines.

Awareness, Attitudes, and Problems at the School Level

16. It is concluded that teamwork is a "problem-area" for teachers--and that it will continue to be. Teamwork and unit communication (working, planning, teaching together) comprised a major concern expressed by teachers, and at the same time it was an area frequently indicated as being the most rewarding. Many principals, too noted unit teamwork as a valued goal accomplished in the first year. The irony is that at the end of the year, 50% of the some 700 teachers polled indicated their preference for "doing things as a unit" half the time or less. There may be satisfactions but teamwork apparently has only a part-time appeal.

17. As there is flexibility at national and state levels, there is parallel flexibility within districts and within schools. Schools have not instituted the same changes or employed the same procedures; nor have there been the same expectations for all personnel within given schools. Implementers took into account known quantities, circumstances, needs, personalities. Thus, when one talks of a nationwide MUSE/IGE installation, he must think and interpret in terms of many schools with many approaches. And when one talks of a MUSE/IGE school, he must think and interpret in terms of its many teachers rooms, units, support staff, and other variables.

18. It is concluded that schools needed more help than they received or knew how to get.

19. School staffs by and large gave MUSE/IGE a fair shake. This was most often accompanied by enthusiasm, hard work, and concern, and thus it appears that the underlying concepts were accepted and generally worked toward. Similarly, progress was typically rated as "good" for both the multi-unit structure and the IGE subject-area. What is not known--and what leaves a trace of suspense--is whether school personnel were responding to the overall patterns (with the requirements, implications, and potential), or more simply to certain practices which they had managed to master with less than a full understanding of the integrated whole.

20. Predisposing factors (such as prior team-teaching or multiaging) are not requisite for MUSE/IGE progress—though of course these may be helpful. A number of schools were observed which successfully moved from strictly traditional patterns to satisfactory MUSE/IGE implementation. Likewise, predisposing factors do not guarantee progress or status. Other schools were observed, with previous teaming and open areas, which were not necessarily moving smoothly on the road to success.

21. There is considerable resistance to overcome. Isolated teachers and even units--and in a few cases, principals--appear not to be persuaded or committed. More ominous perhaps is a different level of resistance and skepticism: the unions which enforce certain constraints; the parents who mount a newspaper attack; the state teachers organization which announces in print its grave doubts and concerns about certain MUSE/IGE implications.

22. The importance of the Instructional Materials Center (IMC) or related library/media facilities, is overlooked in the MUSE model and often in the schools themselves. Similarly, the potential role of the librarian/IMC director in the IIC structure and in IGE instructional programing has been underemphasized.

23. Though this is perhaps not intended, units are independent entities. This circumstance has both advantages and disadvantages, but is something which needs to be recognized and possibly resolved at the school level.

24. The MUSE/IGE concepts make certain assumptions about teacher involvement which are perhaps important but which are also difficult to assure (even once the unit is set up); it is assumed that teachers will teach all subject areas, be a resource leader of some sort within the unit, teach virtually all unit children, manage several instructional group sizes, and participate regularly in a variety of functions as a team.

Miscellaneous Conclusions

25. It is concluded that neither states nor schools (as groups) are ready for independence from national or mutual support and assistance.

26. Systematic feedback as part of the installation process is both important and lacking. Personnel at all levels have not always known what was "really happening out there," down to and including principals who were unaware of many activities and purposes in the separate units.

27. Linkage groups (leagues, pacts, networks, subleagues, and others) are an important, useful, and valuable component in the installation process.

28. Schools run the risk of generating excess problems if they try to master too many "new programs." It seems enough to encounter and implement MUSE/IGE without attempting additional innovative or enervative programs.

29. MUSE and IGE can be separately implemented to a considerable extent. That is not to say that this is good or bad, but it reflects observed approaches wherein some schools moved in one direction and held back on the other. Likewise, from a practical standpoint, it does not appear to matter in which domain implementation is initiated.

Recommendations

Although the emphasis in the evaluation project was on school-level implementation and status, a large number of the recommendations included here fall into the category of "policy recommendations." As such, they refer to planning and installation activities in the state and national spheres. This suggests, of course, that ultimately the needs of the local school can probably best be met by plans, provisions, and decisions made at national and state levels.

The final section is devoted to the policy recommendations. Each of these was presented in full form in Chapter I as part of the project summary, because of their importance to the nationwide installation; here, only the main statement of each recommendation is repeated.

Operations at the School Level

1. The librarian/IMC director should become a regular member of the IIC in order to maximize the contributions of that person and of the library/IMC facility. At the least, both the potentials and the needs of the personnel and facility should be recognized.

2. Staffs, once committed and on their way, would do well to consider a trial period in IGE instructional programing--with <u>all</u> that implies--in place of an immediate descent into the maelstrom. Depending upon previous efforts and present circumstances this might not be necessary; but some schools would clearly benefit by careful planning and implementing of a 3- or 4-week period of "practicing" the instructional programing model. This recommendation applies whether a fall or spring installation is contemplated.

3. A specific action of the IIC (whether new or experienced) might be to generate a file of ALL resources, real or imagined, available or potential, near or distant. As such a list was then applied to the emerging needs of the school, the IMC, the units...it would be possible to either call on such personnel and materials resources or to work through the linkage group or coordinator to arrange such resources. (Many school people did not appear aware of the wide range of possible assistance or support, even when they did in fact exist).

4. Principals and the IIC as a group should make added efforts to know and monitor the operations of the units, in order to coordinate the use of school resources and to narrow the range of problems to be solved. This recommendation has particular reference to the IIC's monitoring the IGE subject-area in the school.

5. On the basis of practical experience, it seems best for all units to begin IGE instructional programing at about the same time and in the same subject-area.

6. No specific recommendation is made about the manner in which unit leaders are assigned. Virtually all principals in the sample reported that their method had been satisfactory, whether they assigned them, whether unit votes were taken, or whether other means were employed. Different situations appear to call for different procedures in this matter.

7. At some point before or very soon after the initiation date, it would be valuable for all staff members to define--in writing--their perceptions of where they are heading, the advantages and/or disadvantages of MUSE/IGE, their "general attitudes," the requirements in order to make the changes viable, or any combination of these. The value lies in specification of personal perceptions, and then the school leaders' awareness of these, and finally the opportunity to make appropriate decisions or attempt new persuasions. A checklist might serve much the same purposes.

8. It seems best for units to have no fewer than 3 teachers and no more than 5, in order to maximize the potentials of teamwork and variety of input provided by teachers.

9. If multiaging needs to be discussed, discuss it. Several resources are available which deal with the advantages and possible disadvantages, and any such material may spark important discussion. Decisions about multiaging should be made early and resistance should be dispelled equitably.

10. Lines of communication are a vital concern, and should not be left to accident. While rigid means are not recommended, what does seem important is early decisions on how to avoid problems in communication (a) between staff teachers and principal, (b) between units, (c) between unit teachers and special-subject teachers, (d) between unit leaders and staff teachers.

11. Whatever instructional record-keeping system is devised, it is recommended that it be versatile so that it can serve as (a) a day-to-day means of noting progress and assigning new work, (b) a vehicle for reporting to parents, (c) a continuum across all units which can follow students as they move "up," (d) a way of satisfying district requirements, (e) an appropriate device for more than one subject. Careful planning is needed and recommended.

12. Agendas and minutes should from the outset be a consistent feature of IIC and unit meeting activity. Without them it is difficult to record decisions, avoid duplication, plan priorities, foresee needs, define immediate problems, evaluate progress, and so on.

13. Implementation timetables are important, at the initial stages and later, even if revised along the way. School staffs, and particularly the IIC, should develop them in written and somewhat detailed form, and they should be prominently displayed for discussion, evaluation, monitoring, and following.

14. Regardless of who directs the training or in what situations, staff members should insist upon discussion of practical implementation matters, consideration of implications and requirements, coordinated planning, and explication of long-range expectations.

Policy Recommendations

1. There is a need for clearcut and sequenced criteria to be developed which may be followed in initiating MUSE/IGE implementation at the school level, and which would also describe typical or reasonable first-year activities as well as year-end expected status.

2. A related recommendation is that such criterion-guidelines be presented in several packages so that schools in varying circumstances might choose the most appropriate set, at least for the initial period of training and installation.

3. Districts and schools should make every effort to send the right staff members for various sorts of training; those who attend the first such training events, moreover, should continue to attend the remainder, and principals should no doubt be required to participate in all formal sessions.

4. In the same sense that a training design is included in the installation model, a design for monitoring all schools would be a boon to the nationwide effort; regular but brief and standard feedback to state coordinators and/or the R & D Center is recommended on such matters as: problems, status, needs, procedures, plans, and outcomes.

5. MUSE and IGE concepts should be clearly defined and promoted as separate parts of an ultimate integrated whole.

6. If the accounting of schools participating in the MUSE/IGE patterns is important for various policy, funding, or dissemination reasons, then improved procedures are needed.

7. It is recommended that careful study be made of the ways in which cooperation and common involvement of the R & D Center and I/D/E/A may be advantageous and disadvantageous.

8. It is recommended that--to the extent possible--the role of the state coordinator as an individual be defined so as to cover such matters as responsibilities, relationships with schools, authority, communication, and feedback.

9. Typically, the state department of education has been the implementation agency in the 1971-72 effort. In the interests of communication, efficiency, and provision of resources, further consideration might be given to making formal arrangements with city, university, and county agencies as well.

10. If training materials are an essential element rather than an optional kind of assistance, then they need to be good enough that all will use them. As new materials are developed, consideration might be given to a careful survey of practitioners' reactions and needs.

11. Similarly, if the training materials are requisite (in theory or reality) to effective implementation, then it must be assured that all school staffs have and use them.

12. Equal or at least minimum access to materials, training, assistance, consultants, and other resources needs somehow to be provided within and across states.

13. It is recommended that a study of continuity be conducted in order to follow schools beyond the first year of activity. This might include longitudinal study of selected schools over a span of years. It would appear important for the R & D Center and state coordinators to follow and assist the first-year crop of schools even while installing new groups of schools throughout the country.

14. The R & D Center and state coordinators have developed many means of communication with the schools. These should be continued (and expanded in some states). It might be useful for state coordinators to exchange such materials for the sake of sharing their individual approaches and the extension of common philosophies and procedures. If this could be conveniently systematized, it might result in the development of a cohesive installation strategy based upon continuing input from a variety of sources.

15. It is recommended that linkage groups be further encouraged, especially on a regional basis within states.

16. Continued availability of on-site technical assistance should be arranged, of the sort provided to some schools by the R & D Center installation teams. Such efforts could be directed to the proposed criterion-guideline packages and might embrace a monitoring function as well as provide assistance in the use of training and curricular materials.

17. The existing specific implementation criteria (behavioral objectives) might be even more useful if the responsibilities of staff teachers and principals were spelled out separately for people in those positions.

18. It is recommended that "inservice training" be defined, required, and monitored so that it becomes a consistent part of the overall training design. Minimum standards would be needed.

A P P E N D I X A

School Survey Questionnaire

O.M.B. No. 51-S-71054
Approval expires 8-31-72.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS OF
NEW MULTIUNIT/IGE SCHOOLS

B

This survey of current status and practice is directed to principals of those schools which have adopted Multiunit/IGE organizational and instructional patterns in the winter of 1972.

The accompanying cover letter outlines the background and purposes of the survey. And it solicits your cooperation in providing descriptive information concerning your school's implementation of Multiunit/IGE patterns so far this year.

Individual schools will not be evaluated; we are concerned with implementation procedures and outcomes in all new Multiunit/IGE schools being installed around the country under the aegis of the Wisconsin Research and Development Center. Data gathered on individual schools will be available for study and summation only to professional researchers employed by Educational Testing Service.

Thank you for your assistance.

215

PLEASE RETURN BY APRIL 14, 1972.
Use the enclosed post-paid envelope.

Educational Testing Service Durham, North Carolina 27701

This study is conducted under contract with the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

School Name _____ Principal _____

Town, State _____ Date _____

Became multiunit/IGE school in [Sept. '71] [Jan/Feb '72] [Other: 19]

1. Descriptive Information for your school:

(a) Check the best single description of school location and population:

___ City (100,000+ population) ___ City (50,000 to 100,000) ___ Suburban to either above cities ___ Rural near either of above cities ___ Small city or town (up to 50,000) ___ Rural area	Check One	Predominant Socioeconomic Level ___ Upper ___ Middle ___ Lower (Gross indication only)

(b) Current total enrollment (to nearest 25) _____

(c) Age range enrolled [to] OR grade range enrolled [to]

(d) Were you principal of this school in 1970-71? Yes___ No___

(e) Which best describes the present building?
___ Separate classrooms opening to hallways
___ Partly separate classrooms, partly open space instructional areas
___ Open space instructional areas
___ Partly areas with movable walls, partly other: (Describe) _____
___ (OTHER) _____

2. (a) How did you first learn about the multiunit/IGE concepts? Check one.
___ a request from the District that you consider the MUSE/IGE pattern
___ professional journals or other publications
___ information made available by District office to all schools
___ personnel in existing MUSE/IGE school(s)
___ attendance at a meeting on MUSE/IGE as an introduction
(Sponsored by: _____)
___ brochure mailed by Wisconsin R & D Center for Cognitive Learning
___ formal or informal presentation at a professional meeting
___ (other) _____

(b) When was your particular school committed to MUSE/IGE for this year?
(Month and year) _____

(c) How did this commitment come about?
___ School staff considered the pattern, and "volunteered"
___ District selected school for this innovation
___ As part of long-range plan to extend MUSE/IGE throughout district
___ Principal's decision on his own
___ (other) _____

(3.) Check any of the following facilities or practices which have characterized the school or its program in the past. Under each item, please amplify as appropriate (e.g., grades affected, subject involved, extent of practice, or size of facility).

	Check Appropriate Period(s)		
	1970-71	1969-70	Earlier
Ungraded primary or school			
Wisconsin design for reading skill development			
Self-contained instructional classrooms			
Departmentalization			
Continuous progress of students			
Team teaching			
Library			
Individualized curriculum			
Learning resources center or media center			
"Open classroom" concept			
Differentiated staffing responsibilities			
Multiage grouping for instruction			

(4.) Of the following, what activities were undertaken to inform (or remind) your school's parents of the new school pattern for this year? Please check which activities occurred, and when (by month) before or during this school year. Add any comment that might explain the purpose or content.

Activity	Date	Comment
___Newspaper article.....		
___Letter from the school....		
___Formal parent meeting (PTA).		
___Announcement from District..		
___Announcement from Board.....		
___Coffees or other informal get-togethers.....		
___Distribution of MUSE/IGE leaflets or booklets.....		
___(other).....		

The following 4 questions relate to persons and groups, beyond the individual school, which are involved in MUSE/IGE implementation efforts.

(5.) Does the district at this time have a central governing or policy group for the installation and continuation of MUSE/IGE schools? ... Yes___ No___

If YES, (a) What is the group's title? ___Central IGE Committee
___ Systemwide Policy Committee (SPC)
___ City (or district) Policy Group
___ (other) _____

(b) How often does it meet so far as you know? _____

(6.) Is there a person now assigned in the district for any of the facilitating functions listed below related to the multiunit/IGE program?...Yes___ No___

If YES, (a) please check the applicable roles for this person:
___ coordinates MUSE/IGE plans & implementation in the district
___ coordinates MUSE/IGE training and use of consultants
___ is liaison between school(s) and District administration
___ is liaison between District and state education agency (or other implementation agency)
___plans extension of MUSE/IGE in the District this year or next
___ (other) _____

(b) Name of person:_____ Exact Title:_____
(For possible follow-up contact)

(7.) In some states, linkages of MUSE/IGE schools have been established on a formal basis, called Leagues, Pacts, or other titles. These Leagues may coordinate training efforts, aid in solving installation problems, or provide feedback and mutual support.

Does such a "League" exist in your state or region ? .....Yes___ No___
If YES, (a) Is your school a member of it at this time?.....Yes___ No___

(b) Which of these best describes its coverage? (check one)
___statewide ___ city school system
___region of the state ___ college or university area

(c) In general, is your League or other linkage serving valuable functions as far as your school is concerned?.....Yes___ No___

(d) Up to now, have there been League-sponsored meetings or conferences addressed to any of these groups?..... Yes___ No___

___ principals ___ aides
___ unit leaders ___ total school staffs
___ all teachers ___ all MUSE/IGE-related personnel

(Please check all that apply).

8. All schools installing MUSE/IGE are under the sponsorship of an intermediate agency or implementation agency. In most cases that agency is the state department of education with a state coordinator as its representative. In a few cases there are city school districts or universities serving as the implementation agency, again with a coordinator as representative.

The 3 questions below ask about your contacts with the coordinator. Please check all appropriate items in each question.

(a) Have you had regular (as opposed to sporadic) contact with your coordinator since school began this fall? ...Yes___ No___ If YES, how?

___ telephone
___ forms, reports, newsletters, agendas, etc., mailed to you
___ your attendance at meetings sponsored or led by coordinator
___ submission by you of IIC logs, progress reports, other information
___ (other) _____

(b) Has your school been visited by the coordinator or a designate from that office?..... Yes ___ No ___ If YES, why?

___ general visit to the school
___ his/her participation in in-service training for your school
___ in response to a request for assistance or consultation
___ (other) _____

(c) Have you directly contacted the coordinator to request assistance concerning any of the following? ...Yes ___ No ___ If YES, which?

___ functioning of the IIC and units
___ IGE curriculum area(s)
___ individualization of instruction
___ working out weekly/daily schedules
___ personnel decisions
___ planning and conducting in-service training
___ use of films and other training materials
___ other schools you might contact for mutual support, or training
___ (other) _____

217

* * * * * * *

9. Does the school have an IIC (Instructional Improvement Committee)? Yes___ No___

If YES, (a) Indicate how many of each category comprise the IIC on a permanent, regular basis:

Total
___

___ principal
___ unit leaders
___ special education teacher
___ librarian or IMC director

OTHERS (give positions)
___ _____
___ _____

(b) How many hours per week are scheduled for regular IIC meetings? ___
(c) Is an agenda prepared for each meeting? Yes ___ No ___
(d) Is a formal log or set of minutes kept for each IIC meeting? .....Yes ___ No ___
(e) In (a) above, please circle the position of the person who is the IIC chairman.
(f) When was the IIC set up? (month/year) _____ 19__
(g) When did the IIC actually begin functioning as the "governing group" for the school's program? (month/year) _____ 19__

10. Schools have various kind of "centers" for books, audio-visual equipment and supplies, and other instructional materials. In your school....

(a) What is this center called? (If more than one, give all names)

_____

(b) What materials, books, equipment, and supplies does it include? _____

_____

(c) REGULAR STAFF CONSISTS OF..

Please show number in each category.

___fulltime librarian ___parttime librarian
___fulltime IMC Director or Media Specialist ___parttime IMC Director or Media Specialist
___fulltime paid aide(s) ___parttime paid aide(s)
___(other)_____ ___parttime volunteer(s)

(d) How do students use the center(s)? Check all that apply.

___on a stated daily or weekly schedule
___as necessary for research and study, with permits
___freely, without schedules or permits
___(other) _____

11. As a guide to the sequence of activities in installing MUSE/IGE and to the responsibilities of various school personnel and groups, are you using a set of "implementation criteria" at this time? Yes___ No___

If YES, (a) Which are you using?

___"IGE Implementation Guide" I/D/E/A, 1970.

___"Individually Guided Education and the Multiunit Elementary School: Education for the 70's" Wisconsin R & D Center, 1970. ("blue book")

___"Performance Objectives for Implementation of IGE/MUS-E" Wisconsin R & D Center, 1971. (color-coded)

(b) By whom was it recommended for your use?

_____

(12.) (a) Please give current descriptive data for each regular unit, separately, i.e., names, numbers of participants, lengths of time, or checkmarks.

UNITS →	X	X	X	X	X
What is unit called? (name, number, grade, letter)					
** Grade-equivalent(s) or Age-range of children or Years in school					
Number of teachers, including unit (team) leader					
Number of children					
Number of student teachers in unit in Spring '72					
Number of paid aides or parsprofessionals					
Number of interns					
Number of (other) _____					
Name(s) of IGE subject area(s) now being emphasized (in each unit)					
Unit leader has own time for planning. (Hours per week)					
Unit regularly meets to plan, assess, set goals, regroup (Hours per week)					
Unit characterized by mix of instructional modes: large, small & medium groups; independent study; tutorial	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No
All teachers teach all subjects and all children to an extent.					

** Check one category (grade-equivalent, age-range, or years-in-school). Then for each unit provide the actual descriptive information.

(b) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all teachers and students accounted for in (a) above? . . . . . Yes___ No___

If NO, please describe the arrangements which cover the remaining students and regular teachers.

_____

_____

(c) Are there any unusual units, special in some way but which function as units so far as teaching, planning, and grouping are concerned? . . . Yes___ No___

If YES, please describe. _____

_____

(OMIT) (d) Beyond the IGE subject(s) now being taught, are you planning to begin any other IGE subject(s) later this school year? ..... Yes ___ No ___

If YES, what subject(s)?_____ when? _____

(13.) Below is a list of the commonly used explanatory and training materials. Please indicate which of these you have had an opportunity to see, hear, or study, at any time and check also for the other personnel listed and name any "others," by title.

		Principal	Unit Ldrs	Staff Tchrs	Aides	OTHERS	
Various IGE filmstrips with accompanying tape cassettes							
* IGE Booklet "Unit Operations and Roles"							
IGE Booklet "Principal's Handbook"							
* IGE Booklet "The Learning Program"							
Wisconsin R & D Technical Report #158, "The Development and Evaluation of the Multi-unit Elementary Schools 1966-70," 16 pp.							
Wisconsin R & D Center brochure, "Individually Guided Education and the multiunit Elementary School: Education for the 70's." 94 pp. ("Blue book")							
I/D/E/A, "IGE Implementation Guide" 1970.							
** FILMS	1. "Many Roads"						
	2. "One at a Time Together"						
	3. "Tuesday"						
	4. "The Unit Meeting"						
Wisconsin R & D Center, "Individually Guided Education: A Simulation." 1971. 30 pp.							

(a) Of the 2 books (*) we have enough for (Check one) ___one to a teacher ___one to a unit ___(other) _____

(b) As to films (**) we have numbers ___, ___, ___, ___ for use in our school alone.
or we share numbers ___, ___, ___, ___ with other District schools.
or we share numbers ___, ___, ___, ___ with other schools in state.

(14.)

What sort of reaction to the MUSE/IGE innovation do you think these groups in your school community generally have at this time? Check for each group, please.	In your own school			In rest of District		
	FAVORABLE	NEUTRAL	UNFAVORABLE	FAVORABLE	NEUTRAL	UNFAVORABLE
Classroom teachers						
Parents						
Principals						
District central office personnel						
Students						
Special teachers (art, phys ed, speech, etc)						
(Other)						

The listings in the next 3 items show a number of the opportunities which have been provided for becoming acquainted with, and learning the specifics of, the MUSE/IGE patterns. We are attempting to include all sorts of conferences and training meetings; personnel representing your school may have attended or participated in only a few.

The main concern is the positions and numbers of those who attended various sessions; positions at the school level are indicated. We are including many personnel positions since various schools have had different representatives. (Attendance by personnel at state and District office levels will be asked for in questionnaires directed to those persons).

Please indicate (below each named position) the number of persons in that category who participated in a particular session. Please add whatever can be easily provided concerning dates, locations, and other information, where asked.

(15.) These 5 types of conferences or workshops appear typical in the overall installation plan for 1971-72. Please indicate attendance or participation by your school personnel; enter number of persons per category per event. Enter any other representative in blank space (*) at the right.

	Principal	Unit (team) Leader (Staff) Teacher	Special Ed. Teacher	Librarian	A/V Director, Media	Special Teacher (art, music,...	Intern, student tchr	Reading Teacher	Counselor	Parent	Aide	*
A. Introductory 1-day national conference on MUSE/IGE. Variously called OVERVIEW, AWARENESS, DISSEMINATION, ORIENTATION, or CLUE-IN. Spring or summer 1971.												
Sponsored by Wisconsin R & D Center ___ OR by I/D/E/A---Kettering ___ (Please check one)												
Where: _____ When (month) _____												
B. 1-day conference for superintendents, principals, state education agency, & others; related to state and district commitments. Sponsored at state level.												
C. (Pre-installation) in-service workshop for school staff(s); overview, commitment, & initial planning. (probably 1 day or less).												
D. 3-day Workshop for principals and unit leaders, and others. Called PRINCIPAL-UNIT LEADER WORKSHOP or STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP. Most'y at state level.												
E. PRESCHOOL WORKSHOP. 3 to 5 days for whole school staff; organizing and planning. Prior to formal implementation.												

(16.) Additional meetings were held which your school personnel may have attended. Please indicate attendance by supplying the number of persons in each category for each workshop. All dates are in 1971, sequentially listed here, except one noted as 1972.

	Principal	Unit (team) Leader (Staff) Teacher	Special Ed. Teacher	Librarian	A/V Director, Media	Special Teacher (art, music,...	Intern, student tchr	Reading Teacher	Counselor	Parent	Aide	*
A. Workshop on READING, in Madison, Wisconsin, 6/28-30. Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development.												
B. 1-week READING INSTITUTE, in Madison, 7/26-30. For reading consultants, state MUSE/IGE coordinators, & others.												
C. 1-week workshop for experienced reading teachers, Madison, 8/2-6.												
D. 1-week workshop for experienced unit leaders, Eau Claire, 8/2-6.												
E. 1-week workshop for experienced principals, Madison, 8/2-6.												
F. 1-week workshop for experienced unit leaders, in any of these locations:												
Eau Claire, 10/27-31												
LaCrosse, 11/2-6												
Milwaukee, 11/1-5												
Toledo, 11/8-12												
G. 1-week workshop for experienced principals, Milwaukee, 11/15-19.												
H. 1-wk workshop; experienced principals & unit leaders; Madison, 1/10-15, 1972.												

(17.) Other opportunities for training and acquaintance, within a state, region or district. Indicate attendance by school representatives.

	Principal	Unit (team) Leader (Staff) Teacher	Special Ed. Teacher	Librarian	A/V Director, Media	Special Teacher (art, music,...	Intern, student tchr	Reading Teacher	Counselor	Parent	Aide	*
A. Visit to operating MUSE/IGE school(s) How many schools visited? ___ When? 1970-71 ___ Fall 1971 ___												
B. League, Pact, or other linkage meeting for sharing, problem-solving, training. For principals, unit leaders, teachers, or total school staffs. (Please do not include HUB meetings).												
C. Special meeting for reading personnel; statewide or regional.												
D. Special staff-development training for 1 or more schools in District, where outside specialists assisted.												
E. Special conference (perhaps on a particular problem); principals, district administration, and others.												
F. OTHER - (Please exclude an individual school's in-service training). Describe:												

The next 3 items ask for a little detail concerning three major areas of training, (a) the STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP, (b) the local school's PRESCHOOL WORKSHOP, and (c) IN-SERVICE training in fall 1971.

Please provide whatever information can be easily gathered and reported. Since these are three very useful "levels" of training and exposure, it is important for us to learn what they have had in common, and how they have varied from school to school. Most questions are presented in the check-list or fill-in mode.

(18.) An earlier item ((15) D on page P-8) asked you to indicate who from your school attended the Staff Development Workshop held on a statewide basis (or in a few cases for a region or large city). Can you tell us more about it, please.
(---Staff Development Workshop is also known as Principal-Unit Leader Workshop.---)

(a) Where held?_____ (b) Dates _____19__

(c) Sponsored by what agency(ies)? 1. _____

2. _____

(d) What were the major purposes (please list 2 or 3); and do you feel that these were fulfilled in preparing for MUSE/IGE implementation?

Purposes	Fulfilled?

(e) Were special outside consultants on hand for the Workshop? . . Yes___ No___
If YES, please indicate from what agencies or organizations.

1. _____

2. _____

(f) At the time of the Workshop, had Unit Leaders been named? . . Yes___ No___
If YES, during the Workshop did your school's IIC meet as such for discussion and planning MUSE/IGE implementation? . . . Yes___ No___
If YES, (a) Approximately how many separate meetings? _____
(b) About how much total time (in hours)? ____

(g) As an overall assessment, how would you rate the meaningfulness and effectiveness of the Staff Development Workshop? Check one.

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak

250

(19.) Most schools have had, prior to formal implementation, a PRESCHOOL WORKSHOP or other formal means of getting ready for the transition to a multiunit school and getting ready for children and teachers to adopt new patterns. Did your school have such a PRESCHOOL WORKSHOP? . . . . . Yes___ No___
If YES, please answer the following questions:

(a) Month held? _____19
(b) Total length of time (to nearest 1/2 day)? _____ days
(c) Was a specific program/agenda prepared for the Workshop? Yes___ No___
(d) CHECK ONE: ___Workshop was for your schoolstaff alone
___Workshop was with ___ other school staff(s)

(e) What particular roles (in training and/or leadership) did any of the following persons have in the Workshop?

Person	Briefly State Workshop Role
Principal	
Unit Leaders	
Reading Consultant (local)	
Superintendent or other persons from District offices	
Local coordinator	
State (or agency) coordinator	
Special Consultants (From where?) 1.	
2.	

(f) The current staff of your school attended and participated to these extents...(Check one for each personnel category).

Persons	Attended Total Wkshp	Attended Part Wkshp	Didn't Attend	Persons	Attended Total Wkshp	Attended Part Wkshp	Didn't Attend
Unit Leaders				Special Tchrs (art, speech, phy ed, etc)			
(Staff) teachers							
Aides							
Interns				Secretary			
Librarian or IMC director				(Other)			
Principal(s)							

(g) As part of the Workshop, the units met--as units--for discussion, planning, grouping, choosing materials, etc., for about ____ hour(s).
(h) As part of the Preschool Workshop the IIC met for about ____ hour(s).

If NO, what other provisions were made for "getting ready" to begin as a MUSE/IGE school? Please describe.

_____

_____

_____

(20.) Please indicate below whatever formal in-service training has been conducted for the whole school staff--since school began in September--concerning aspects of MUSE/IGE implementation. A few other questions are also asked. The concern here is with in-service for the whole staff, not that within Units.

(a) A number of possible topics is listed. Show those which your staff has dealt with by indicating date and time devoted to the topic. Also, please check any topics you plan to cover in future in-service meetings.

Topic or Activity	Date By Month Only	How Long In Hours?	Total School Staff Present? YES	NO	Planning To Have Such Training? Yes	No	If YES, When? (Month)
1. Reading							
2. Mathematics							
3. Other Subject Area(s)							
4. Grouping Children							
5. Diagnosis & Assessment							
6. IGE Record-Keeping							
7. Development of Materials for Students							
8. Behavorial Objectives							
9. Reporting Procedures (to parents)							
10. Train aides and other paraprofessionals							
11. Unit functions							
12. Pupil' Learning Modes							
13. Evaluation of School's MUSE/IGE progress							
14. (other)							
15. (other)							
16. (other)							

(b) In-service sessions are usually planned by _____

(c) Do you have a predetermined schedule of MUSE/IGE in-service meetings for the school staff? (e.g., 3rd Tuesday, 1-1/2 hours). . . . . Yes___ No___
If YES, outline it here:

(d) Please check any of the following persons or groups who have taken an active role in planning or conducting your school's formal in-service this year?

___ State coordinator (or other implementation agency)
___ Local coordinator (if one)
___ Personnel from other MUSE/IGE schools
___ Wisconsin R & D Center
___ I/D/E/A (Kettering Foundation)
___ District consultants, specialists
___ "Outside" consultants, specialists
___ (other) _____

(21.) So far this year in your school, have there been particular impacts on people or practices which you see as related to the introduction of MUSE/IGE? The list below is suggestive only; please describe any effects or impacts you deem noteworthy. If there has been no particular impact for a given topic, please check column marked "None."

Topic	None	Impact Description	Viewed as Positive	Viewed as Negative
1. Pupil grading and reporting				
2. Parent involvement or reaction				
3. Inquiries from other schools in District				
4. Reaction or coverage by the press				
5. Attendance				
6. Inquiries from outside your District				
7. Staff requests or needs for instructional materials				
8. Student excitement or achievement				
9. Teacher teamwork and cooperative planning				
10. Staff requests for in-service training and/or consultants				
11. Decision-making				
12.				
13.				

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

APPENDIX C

District Survey Questionnaire

O.M.B. NO. 51-S-71055
Approval expires 8-31-72.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DISTRICT PERSONNEL
OF NEW MULTIUNIT/IGE SCHOOLS

This survey of current status and practice is directed to central office administrators in districts where at least one new Multiunit/IGE school was initiated in the winter, 1972. Such initiation is defined as the adoption of Multiunit/IGE organizational and instructional patterns.

The accompanying cover letter outlines the background and purposes of the survey. And it solicits your cooperation in providing descriptive information concerning your District's implementation of Multiunit/IGE patterns so far this year.

Individual school districts will not be evaluated; we are concerned with implementation procedures and outcomes in all districts with new Multiunit/IGE schools being installed around the country under the aegis of the Wisconsin Research and Development Center. Data gathered on schools and districts will be available for study and summation only to professional researchers employed by Educational Testing Service.

Thank you for your assistance.

PLEASE RETURN BY APRIL 14, 1972.
Use the enclosed post-paid envelope.

Educational Testing Service Durham, North Carolina 27701

This study is conducted under contract with the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

ERIC

School District _____ Form Completed By _____

Town, State _____ District Position _____

Date _____

D-1

(1.) Which elementary (or middle) schools are new multiunit/IGE schools in your district this year?

For each, please indicate name and date of installation. If other than dates shown, enter month/year of installation.

SCHOOL NAME(S)	When did school begin MUSE/IGE this year? Sept. '71	Jan/Feb '72	Other
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			

(2.) Is there a person now assigned in the district for any of the facilitating functions listed below related to the multiunit/IGE program?..... Yes___ No___

If YES, (a) please check the applicable roles for this person:
___ coordinates multiunit/IGE plans and implementation in-district
___ coordinates multiunit/IGE training and use of consultants
___ is liaison between school(s) and District administration
___ is liaison between District and state implementation agency
___ plans extension of multiunit/IGE in the District this year or next
___ (Other) _____

(b) Person's name: _____ Exact Title: _____
(For possible follow-up contact)

If NO, are there plans to assign such a person in the District? .... Yes___ No___

(3.) Does the District have a central governing or policy group for the installation and continuation of multiunit/IGE patterns? ..... Yes___ No___

If YES, (a) please indicate its title:
___ Central IGE Committee ___ City (or District) Policy Committee
___ Systemwide Policy Committee ___ (other) _____

(b) Indicate number of persons in each category on the committee (e.g., 1 Supt., 2 Principal).

Total Number ___

___ Supt. ___ Principal ___ (other) _____
___ Asst. Supt. ___ Unit Leader ___ (other) _____
___ Assoc. Supt. ___ Teacher ___ (other) _____
___ Elem. Supvr. ___ Counselor

(c) Please circle the position (above) held by the group's chairman.

(d) How often does this group regularly meet? Check one.
___weekly ___2/month ___monthly ___2/year ___yearly
___ (other) _____

If NO, (a) Are there plans to develop such a group? ..... Yes___ No___
(b) If so, when? _____

(4.) Did your school district have or install any multiunit/IGE elementary or middle schools last year -- 1970-71?.....Yes___ No___

If YES, (a) How many? _____
(b) In connection with which agency (ies)?
___ Wisconsin R & D Center
___ I/D/E/A (Kettering Foundation)
___ State Department of Public Instruction
___ A college or university (Name _____)
___ (Other) _____
(c) Is any one such school (from last year) now fully organized into units?...Yes___ No___

*** (d) IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO THIS QUESTION --Number 4-- PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION (12) on page D-4.

IF YOU ANSWERED "NO," please continue with question (5).

* * * * *

(5.) How did the District first learn about the multiunit/IGE patterns?
___ Professional journals or other regular publications
___ personnel in districts already having MUSE/IGE schools
___ brochure mailed by the Wisconsin R & D Center for Cognitive Learning
___ attendance at a meeting on MUSE/IGE as an introduction or overview (sponsored by _____)
___ a request that you consider adopting MUSE/IGE in the District
___ formal or informal presentation at a professional meeting
___ (other) _____

(6.) After the District began to explore and become acquainted with MUSE/IGE concepts, and before actual commitment and Agreement to adopt the MUSE/IGE pattern, to which of the following were MUSE/IGE concepts and possibilities made known? Please check those applicable.
___ School Board
___ All principals in district
___ Selected principal(s)
___ District central administration
___ Local teacher organization
___ PTA's and like groups
___ (other) _____

(7.) What major considerations made it feasible and/or desirable to install the multiunit/IGE patterns in district school(s) this year? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(8.) Check the innovations listed below (as well as any other formal or informal innovations) which have been tried or adopted anywhere in the District in the period 1968-71; excluding the formal multiunit/IGE patterns per se. Check only those practices which relate to staffing, grouping of children, individualization, curriculum, or related utilization of space. Please also describe the scope where that is feasible (e.g., nongraded primary in 2 schools for 1-1/2 years; or team teaching in upper intermediate, 1 school for 1 year).

___open-space building _____

___central instructional-materials facility _____

___team teaching _____

___employment of paraprofessionals _____

___use of Wisconsin Reading Design _____

___continuous progress _____

___ungraded school _____

___(other) _____

___(other) _____

(9.) What sorts of reactions to this MUSE/IGE innovation do you think these groups in your District generally have at this time?

	Those directly involved in MUSE/IGE school(s)			Others in the school system and community		
	FAVORABLE	NEUTRAL	UNFAVORABLE	FAVORABLE	NEUTRAL	UNFAVORABLE
Teachers						
Other staff (e.g., aides, student-teachers, interns						
Parents						
Principals						
District central office personnel						
Students						
Board Members						
(Other)						

(10.) In some states, Leagues (or Pacts or other linkages) of MUSE/IGE schools have been established on a formal basis. These Leagues may coordinate certain training efforts, aid to solving installation problems, or provide feedback and mutual support.

Does such a "League" exist in your state or region as far as you know? Yes___ No___
If YES, (a) Are school(s) in your District a part of it? . . . . . Yes___ No___

(b) In general, is your League or other linkage serving useful purposes as far as your district is concerned? . . . . . Yes___ No___

(11.) Which of the following explanator and training materials have you had an opportunity to see, hear, or study, at any time? Please check.

___ Various IGE filmstrips with accompanying tape cassettes (I/D/E/A Kettering)
___ ICE Booklet "Unit Operations and Roles"
___ ICE Booklet "Principal's Handbook"
___ IGE Booklet "The Learning Program"

FILMS
___ "Many Roads"
___ "One at a Time Together"
___ "Tuesday"
___ "The Unit Meeting"

___ Wisconsin R & D Center Technical Memo, "Individually Guided Education: A Simulation." 1971, 30 pp.
___ Wisconsin R & D Center Technical Report #158, "The Development and Evaluation of the Multiunit Elementary School 1966-70." 16 pp.
___ Wisconsin R & D Center brochure "Individually Guided Education and the Elementary School--Elementary Education for the 70's". 94 pp. (Often called the "blue book").
___ I/D/E/A Implementation Guide (I/D/E/A Kettering) 1970

___ (Other) _____

(12.) So far this year, have there been particular impacts in the District related to installation of MUSE/IGE? The list below is suggestive; please indicate any areas of impact. If there has been no particular impact for listed topics, check the column marked "None."

Topic	None	Impact Description	Viewed as Positive	Viewed as Negative
1. School Board discussions or decisions				
2. Pupil grading and reporting				
3. Parent reaction				
4. Inquiries from other districts				
5. Reaction or coverage by the press				
6. Teacher morale				
7. Inquiries from other schools within District				
8. Standardized achievement testing				
9. Modifications to buildings				
10.				
11.				

The following 4 questions concern a number of "policy matters" related to the MUSE/IGE installation in your District. After the status of each topic is asked about, we also request that you indicate what person or group makes policy decisions about that topic. We are concerned only with matters that relate specifically to the MUSE/IGE school(s) during this school year.

If you have plans or policies--at the District level--in printed form, please attach a copy and fill in only the items below not covered in such documents.

To indicate person or group responsible for setting policy, use this code. Indicate more than one, if appropriate. (If "other," please supply the group's name or person's title).

A. School Board
B. Superintendent
C. Principal
D. District coordinator for MUSE/IGE
E. Systemwide Policy Committee or other "governing group." See item 3 page 1.
Other

(13.) (a) Are there (or will there be) student-teachers this year in your MUSE/IGE school(s)? ..... Yes___ No___

(b) If there is district policy concerning involvement of student-teachers in MUSE/IGE schools, please indicate its main features:

_____

_____

(c) Do you have--or foresee--any special relationship between the district and a teacher-training institution relating to MUSE/IGE patterns? ..... Yes___ No___
If YES, please specify:

_____

_____

(d) PERSON OR GROUP RESPONSIBLE FOR SETTING POLICY: ☐☐ Other: _____

(14.) (a) Did the District undertake certain activities specifically to inform parents and the community of the new MUSE/IGE plans for this year? Yes___ No___
If YES, please check which steps were taken, indicate when (if feasible) by month, and add any explanatory comment.

Activity	Month	Comment
___ Newspaper article		
___ District letter		
___ Parent meetings		
___ School Board notices		
___ MUSE/IGE publications		
___ Coffees for parents		
___ (Other)		

(b) PERSON OR GROUP RESPONSIBLE FOR SETTING POLICY: ☐☐ Other: _____

15. (a) Will the MUSE/IGE effort this year in your District be studied or evaluated by any agency outside the individual school itself? If so, please indicate, and check whether formally or informally.

Organization	Formally	Informally
___ by the District (research group, or _____)		
___ by the state education agency.		
___ by a college or university.		
___ by another agency, under contract		
___ in connection with ESEA Title I or III programs		
___ (other)		
___ (other)		

(b) Are there any District policies or requirements concerning MUSE/IGE evaluation and/or accountability this school year? . . . . . Yes___ No___

If YES, please indicate the major provisions.

_____

_____

_____

(c) PERSON OR GROUP RESPONSIBLE FOR SETTING POLICY: ☐☐ Other: _____

16. (a) Have in-service activities specifically related to MUSE/IGE installation taken place under the sponsorship or direction of the district so far this school year? (Does not include in-service undertaken by an individual school staff) . . . . . Yes___ No___

If YES, please indicate nature and frequency.

Nature	Frequency So Far This School Year
An extension credit course	
1-day in-service	
1/2 day or less in-service	
District personnel as resource to IIC or unit meetings	
(other)	
(other)	

If NO, are such District-sponsored activities being planned for later this year? . . . . . Yes___ No___

(b) Does the District have defined policy concerning in-service activities this year? . . . . . Yes___ No___

If YES, please indicate its main features (which might concern released time, frequency, budget allowance, use of space, use of consultants, etc.).

_____

_____

_____

_____

(c) PERSON OR GROUP RESPONSIBLE FOR SETTING POLICY: ☐☐ Other: _____

The listings in the next 3 items show a number of the opportunities which have been provided for becoming acquainted with, and learning the specifics of, the MUSE/IGE patterns. We are attempting to include all sorts of conferences and training meetings; personnel representing the District may have attended or participated in only a few.

The main concern is the positions and numbers of those who attended various sessions; positions at the District level are indicated, including principals--since in many cases principals were involved in the initial "awareness" stages. (Attendance by personnel at state and individual-school levels will be asked for in questionnaires directed to those persons).

Please indicate (below each named position at the District level) the number of persons in that category who participated in a particular session. Please add whatever can be easily provided concerning dates, locations, and other information.

17. These 5 types of conferences or workshops appear typical in the overall installation plan for 1971-72. Please indicate attendance or participation by District personnel; enter number of persons per category per event. Enter any other representative in blank space (*) at the right.

	Superintendent	Asscc., or Asst., Supt.	Supervisor and/or Curriculum Consultant	Reading Specialist	Dir. of Instruction	Dir. of Research	Board Member	Dir. Federal Proper.	Pupil Personnel Services	Principal	*
A. Introductory 1-day national conference on MUSE/IGE. Variously called OVERVIEW, AWARENESS, DISSEMINATION, ORIENTATION, or CLUE-IN. Spring or summer 1971.											
Sponsored by Wisconsin R & D Center___ OR by I/D/E/A---Kettering ___ (Please check one)											
Where: _____ When (month) _____											
B. 1-day conference for superintendents, principals, state education agency, & others related to state and district commitments. Sponsored at state level.											
C. (Pre-installation) in-service workshop for school staff(s); overview, commitment, & initial planning. (probably 1 day or less).											
D. 3-day Workshop for principals and unit leaders, and others. Called PRINCIPAL-UNIT LEADER WORKSHOP or STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP. Often at state level.											
Where: _____ When (month) _____											
E. PRESCHOOL WORKSHOP in your District's new MUSE/IGE school(s). 3 to 5 days for whole school staff, organizing and planning. Prior to formal implementation.											

18. Additional meetings are listed here which District representatives may have attended. Please indicate attendance by supplying the number of persons in each category. All dates are in 1971 except one.

	Superintendent	Assoc. or Asst. Supt.	Supervisor and/or Curriculum Consultant	Reading Specialist	Dir. of Instruction	Dir. of Research	Board Member	Dir. Federal Progr.	Dir. Pupil Personnel Services	Principal
A. Leadership conference in Madison, Wisconsin, 6/14-18. Called NATIONAL SEMINAR; for state education agency personnel, and others										
B. Workshop on READING, in Madison, Wis., 6/28-30. Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development.										
C. 1-week READING INSTITUTE, in Madison, 7/26-30. For reading consultants, state MUSE/IGE coordinators, & others.										
D. COORDINATOR NETWORK WORKSHOP, Madison, 10/18-20 or 2/1/72. MUSE/IGE coordinators, state consultants, and others.										
19. There have been other opportunities for training and acquaintance with MUSE/IGE, within a state, region, or district. Please indicate attendance by District representatives.										
A. Visit to operating MUSE/IGE school(s) How many schools visited? When? 1970-71 ___ Fall 1971 ___										
B. League or Pact meeting for sharing, problem-solving, information, or for training.										
C. Special meeting for reading personnel; statewide or regional.										
D. Special staff-development training for 1 or more schools in District, where outside specialists assisted.										
E. Special conference (perhaps on a particular problem); principals, district administration, and others.										
F. OTHER - (Please exclude an individual school's in-service training). _____										

Notes (to add to or explain meetings referred to in item 19).

20. With respect to the new MUSE/IGE school(s) in the District this year, have central office personnel served as consultants or resource persons in the training and installation efforts affecting the new school(s)? Please briefly describe what sorts of leadership or consultation have been provided by the central office staff to the staff of the implementing school(s) and indicate the positions of the persons providing such assistance and direction. Include formal or informal occasions where leadership or direction were provided.

Nature of Assistance or Direction (e.g., led discussion groups, or made presentation)	Title of District Central Staff Person Involved

21. If there is anything about this year's installation which is important (or of interest) which we haven't asked about, please add any notes here. This might also include any plans the District has for extending the number of MUSE/IGE schools either in January/February 1972 or September 1972.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.
PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE POST-PAID ENVELOPE.
Educational Testing Service, Durham, N. C. 27701

APPENDIX E

Detailed Installation Questionnaire

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE SOUTHEASTERN OFFICE

501 Willard Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701

APRIL 1972

To: District personnel, Principals, and school Staffs installing multiunit/IGE schools in 1971-72

From: R. A. Ironside, ETS project director for MUSE/IGE

As a continuing part of our work in documenting the nationwide installation of MUSE/IGE this year, we are seeking some information in addition to what schools and districts provided in the earlier questionnaires. Besides our site visits, contact with coordinators and the R & D Center, and attendance at various meetings, we have one more activity: gathering detailed information about particular features of implementation from a sample of schools. These schools represent both September 1971 and February 1972 implementers, in all nine states involved.

This time we are asking that school staffs respond in several ways via different questionnaires. All of them are brief excepting the one for the IIC. And for convenience they are in different colors. Here is an overview of instruments:

PERSONNEL	COLOR	MAXIMUM TIME REQUIRED
1. District representative	yellow	15 minutes
2. School principal	green	25 minutes
3. All unit teachers & leaders	blue	20 minutes
4. IMC Director/librarian	orange	15 minutes
5. Each unit--as a team	pink	20 minutes
6. The IIC--as a committee	white	50 minutes
7. IGE subject specialist	salmon	15 minutes

May we request that the units and IIC respond to the instruments during a regular meeting; extra "working copies" are included for the units and IIC, but only one copy for other individual respondents. Please return only the "final" copy for the IIC and each unit.

We trust that the forms will be useful to you as an aid in reviewing various criteria, as well as to us in the study of processes. Individuals and groups may find value in studying items and deciding on answers, as well as in seeing the range of practices and topics this year. In addition, feedback--overall and by state-- will be passed on to the state coordinator who in turn can provide it to you.

ETS staff researchers will receive and study the responses. As before, we assure all personnel that no data will be reported in such a way as to reveal district, school, or individual identity. Moreover, only a school code is used and we do not ask you to indicate school or personal names.

We are interested primarily in summary information across the sample of schools in order to describe installation as an ongoing process and to capture in words the problems and solutions you have experienced.

For school materials, may we ask that the principal distribute them to the appropriate persons and groups. Individual post-paid return envelopes are provided to make responding and mailing easier.

Please complete and return the questionnaires by May 10.

Again, thank you for your assistance. We are certain that the information gathered will be valuable as an aid to next year's installation process at the same time that it will document this year's nationwide activities.

O.M.B. No. 51-S-72023
Approval expires 12-31-72.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DISTRICT PERSONNEL

We appreciate your responding to the earlier questionnaire in February with information concerning installation of multiunit/IGE patterns in the District. In sending this brief instrument now, we are asking for up-dated data about the relationships between the school(s) and the District in the installation effort. We are also asking for a few personal reactions and for verification of one or two items asked earlier.

1. Does the District now have a central governing or policy group for the installation and continuation of multiunit/IGE patterns?.....Yes___ No___
(Such a group is often called the Systemwide Policy Committee or Central Committee or District Planning Committee)

2. Is there now a person assigned in the District as the liaison person or local coordinator, with various responsibilities such as coordinating among schools, relating to the R & D Center, and overall planning?.....Yes___ No___

3. As a guide to the sequence of activities and the nature of various personnel responsibilities in installing MUSE/IGE, are you using an "implementation guide" at this time?.....Yes___ No___
If YES, (a) which are you using?

___"IGE Implementation Guide" I/D/E/A, 1970.

___"Individually Guided Education and the Multiunit Elementary School: Education for the 70's" Wisconsin R & D Center, 1970. ("blue book")

___"Performance Objectives for Implementation of IGE/MUS-E" Wisconsin R & D Center, 1971 (color-coded)

___"Performance Objectives for Implementation of IGE/MUS-E" Wisconsin R & D Center, 1972. Revised Version (color-coded)

(b) How are you using such guide(s)?
___Reference source, as an implementation aid for ideas
___Checklist for completed activities
___Record of projected dates, dates of accomplishment, means used, or plans for accomplishment
___As a way of assessing status and progress

___(Other)_____

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor
(c) How do you rate the guide's overall usefulness in terms of providing or clarifying long-range goals and the "total picture" of MUSE/IGE?.....					
(d) How do you rate the guide's overall usefulness as an aid in first-year implementation of MUSE/IGE?.....					

(4.) Please check any of the following in which the superintendent's office, district liaison or coordinator, or district "governing group" has assisted the new school(s) in the district in this year's installation effort. ("Assistance" may include giving support or approval.)

Assistance has been provided in...

___ (a) selecting a subject-area for IGE implementation
___ (b) a principal's selection of Unit leaders
___ (c) promoting non-gradedness in the school
___ (d) promoting continuous progress as an instructional strategy
___ (e) finding or developing behavioral objectives for IGE subjects
___ (f) assessing students' skills and needs, and fitting this into the district's "testing program"
___ (g) hiring additional staff for the MUSE/IGE school(s)
___ (h) acquiring multiple materials for IGE instruction
___ (i) developing articulation between elementary school and junior high or middle school
___ (j) arranging for unit and IIC meeting/planning time
___ (k) publicizing the new patterns
___ (l) planning or conducting in-service training

(5.) Has the District (through one means or another) enunciated policy or provided special guidelines with respect to any of the following as they affect the new MUSE/IGE schools? Please check those which apply.

___ (a) responsibilities of aides (or restrictions on their duties)
___ (b) selection of IGE subject or curriculum materials
___ (c) procedures for reporting pupil progress to parents
___ (d) assignment of special teachers (art, phy ed, music, speech, etc.)
___ (e) including Special Education or Emotionally-Physically Handicapped in units
___ (f) assignment of student-teachers
___ (g) communications between the school and parent (as well as community)
___ (h) evaluation of the MUSE/IGE school(s) or of particular outcomes this year

___ (i) (Other)_____

(6.) Are you planning to expand MUSE/IGE installation next school year?.....Yes___ No___
If YES, (a) how many schools will be added in 1972-73?....._____
(b) this will make a total of how many in 1972-73?....._____

(7.) Please indicate your general personal feeling about the multiunit school concepts (MUSE) and individually-guided education (IGE). Check one item on the scale for the beginning of the school year, and one for now, for both MUSE and IGE.

		CAUTIOUS	NETURAL	AGREEABLE	ENTHUSIASTIC
MUSE	(a) Beginning				
	(b) Now				
IGE	(c) Beginning				
	(d) Now				

O.M.B No. 51-S-72023
Approval expires 12-31-72.

IMC DIRECTOR, LIBRARIAN, OR MEDIA SPECIALIST

1. Were any changes or new provisions made for your "materials center-library" specifically in relation to the MUSE/IGE patterns?.....Yes___ No___
If YES, please check the items below and add a brief explanatory note.

___ (a) Amount of Space:_____

___ (b) Location of space:_____

___ (c) Seats, tables, study areas:_____

___ (d) Staff_____

___ (e) Supply of instructional materials:_____

___ (f) Accesibility of materials to students & teachers:_____

_____

___ (g) (Other):_____

If NO, what plans are there for such changes for next school year?

_____

_____

2. (a) Are you a member of the Instructional Improvement Committee (IIC)?..Yes___ No___
If NO, do you sometimes attend IIC meetings in this school?.....Yes___ No___
(b) Do you think the librarian-IMC director should be an IIC member, or see particular advantages or disadvantages in this?

_____

_____

_____

3. Please indicate the rough percentages of your total time in this school which you have spent in various activities this school year. (To the nearest 5% or 10%).

___ (a) Managing the flow of materials, and supervising students
___ (b) Developing resource files for various subject-matter instructional units
___ (c) Stocking the IMC-library wich materials, equipment, books, supplies
___ (d) Instructing groups of students in use of the IMC-library
___ (e) Operating audio-visual equipment
___ (f) Attending unit meetings in relation to instructional programs and needs

___ (g) (Other)_____

100%

4. Typically, how do students use the IMC-library? Check all that apply.

___ (a) On a stated daily or weekly schedule, from units or classrooms
___ (b) As necessary for work and study, with permits from teachers
___ (c) As necessary for work and study, without permits from teachers
___ (d) Freely, during the day, without schedules or permits
___ (e) For certain kinds of lessons; with teacher, aide, or older students

___ (f) (Other)_____

A. An important aspect of MUSE/IGE preparation and implementation is the "training received by staff members. We know that localities and states--as well as individuals--have had different kinds and amounts of such training and exposure, and would like to get a sense of your reactions to whatever has been your experience.

1. (a) IN GENERAL, how do you rate your overall training and exposure up to now in terms of its adequacy in

1. Preparing you for--and assisting you in--taking on your new role in this year's implementation?...
2. Informing you about the multiunit structure, purposes and operations?.....
3. Informing you about the purposes and procedures of individually-guided education?.....

(b) How do you rate your school's in-service program in terms of its being adequate to your needs this year?.

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor
1.					
2.					
3.					
(b)					

2. If you could set up a workshop of your own devising right now, what would its purpose and topic be?

_____

_____

3. If there are weaknesses in the whole training design, what one weakness stands out in your mind?

_____

4. Compared with your actual experience in training and exposure, would you prefer to have had more....

	YES	NO
(a) training prior to MUSE/IGE implementation?.....		
(b) training during MUSE/IGE implementation?.....		
(c) contact with "outside" consultants?.....		
(d) practical "how-to-do-it" training?.....		
(e) opportunity to develop & discuss plans?.....		

B. Please indicate your personal reaction concerning implementation "success" in your school at this time.

I feel that...

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor
(a) implementation of the multiunit structure has been...					
(b) implementation of the IGE instructional model in _____(name subject area) has been.....					
_____(name subject area) has been.....					

C. If you were going to advise a school considering "going IGE/MUSE" next year, what would your single most important piece of advice be? Please be candid.

_____

_____

D. Please indicate your general personal feeling about the multiunit school concepts (MUSE) and individually-guided education (IGE). Check one item on the scale for the beginning of the school year, and one for now, for both MUSE and IGE.

		CAUTIOUS	NEUTRAL	AGREEABLE	ENTHUSIASTIC
MUSE	(a) Beginning				
	(b) Now				
IGE	(c) Beginning				
	(d) Now				

O.M.B. No. 51-S-72023
Approval expires 12-31-72.

SCHOOL OR DISTRICT SPECIALIST IN THE IGE SUBJECT-AREA

If you are a specialist, or a special teacher, in either the MUSE/IGE school or the school District--WITH RESPECT TO AN IGE SUBJECT-AREA UNDERTAKEN THIS YEAR--please complete this brief questionnaire. It is concerned with your role in the total installation picture and your personal reactions.

1. For what IGE subject-area are you a special teacher or subject specialist?
___ Reading ___ Language Arts
___ Science
___ Mathematics ___ (Other) _____

2. We are aware that not all training and workshops have been conducted directly in conjunction with the multiunit and IGE training this past year. Please indicate what particular training sessions you have participated in which related to your subject-area as an "individualized curriculum," and which you attended because of the MUSE/IGE patterns being adopted in your school(s). These may have been sponsored by R & D Center, your District, League, or other agency.
(a) Reading ___ workshop on reading; Madison, Wisc., June 28-30, 1971
___ reading institute; Madison, July 26-30, 1971
___ reading workshop; Madison, August 2-6, 1971

___ (Other) _____

___ (Other) _____

(b) Other subject area: _____

___ (training) _____

___ (training) _____

___ (training) _____

3. (a) Are you a member of the Instructional Improvement Committee (IIC)?..Yes___ No___
If NO, do you sometimes attend IIC meetings in this school?.....Yes___ No___

(b) Do you think the special teacher or subject specialist should be an IIC member, or see particular advantages or disadvantages in this?

_____

_____

_____

4. Please indicate the rough percentages of your total time in this school which you have spent in various activities this school year. (To the nearest 5% or 10%).

___ (a) Teaching children (demonstration teaching or regular skill instruction)
___ (b) Training (whole school staff or separate units or individuals)
___ (c) Monitoring overall progress of units in IGE implementation
___ (d) Managing the flow and use of all sorts of materials for the IGE subject-area
___ (e) Attending unit meetings in relation to instructional programs and needs
___ (f) Developing teaching and testing materials (or finding & organizing them)

___ (g) (Other) _____
100%

A. An important aspect of MUSE/IGE preparation and implementation is the "training received by staff members. We know that localities and states--as well as individuals--have had different kinds and amounts of such training and exposure, and would like to get a sense of your reactions to whatever has been your experience.

(1) (a) IN GENERAL, how do you rate your overall training and exposure up to now in terms of its adequacy in

1. Preparing you for--and assisting you in--taking on your new role in this year's implementation?...
2. Informing you about the multiunit structure, purposes and operations?.....
3. Informing you about the purposes and procedures of individually-guided education?.....

(b) How do you rate your IGE subject-area training in terms of its being adequate to your needs this year?.

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor
1.					
2.					
3.					
(b)					

(2) If you could set up a workshop of your own devising right now, what would its purpose and topic be?

_____

_____

(3) If there are weaknesses in the whole training design, what one weakness stands out in your mind?

_____

(4) Compared with your actual experience in training and exposure, would you prefer to have had more....

	YES	NO
(a) training prior to MUSE/IGE implementation?.....		
(b) training during MUSE/IGE implementation?.....		
(c) contact with "outside" consultants?.....		
(d) practical "how-to-do-it" training?.....		
(e) opportunity to develop & discuss plans?.....		

B. Please indicate your personal reaction concerning implementation "success" in your school at this time.

I feel that...

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor
(a) implementation of the multiunit structure has been...					
(b) implementation of the IGE instructional model in _____(name subject area) has been.....					
_____(name subject area) has been.....					

C. If you were going to advise a school considering "going IGE/MUSE" next year, what would your single most important piece of advice be? Please be candid.

_____

_____

D. Please indicate your general personal feeling about the multiunit school concepts (MUSE) and individually-guided education (IGE). Check one item on the scale for the beginning of the school year, and one for now, for both MUSE and IGE.

		CAUTIOUS	NEUTRAL	AGREEABLE	ENTHUSIASTIC
MUSE	(a) Beginning				
	(b) Now				
IGE	(c) Beginning				
	(d) Now				

O.M.B. No. 51-S-72023
Approval expires 12-31-72.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PRINCIPAL

We appreciate your responding to the earlier instrument during the winter. In order to keep up to date with installation activities and to get some additional information and feedback from you, we are asking that you complete this shorter questionnaire as part of the research effort with the whole school staff. Less than a half-hour is involved, since most items are in the check list format. As you will note, page 5 of the questionnaire is an insert sheet.

. Please try to describe the present general feeling and attitude of the total staff toward the multiunit organization (MUSE) and toward individually guided education (IGE)--as you see it now. Please enter rough percentages of the staff in any or all of the 4 categories (to the nearest 5% or 10%).

	Cautious	Neutral	Agreeable	Enthusiastic	
GENERAL FEELING TOWARD MUSE...	%	%	%	%	100%
GENERAL FEELING TOWARD IGE....	%	%	%	%	100%

. Selection of Unit Leaders for this school year.

(a) Unit Leaders were assigned/appointed in (month & year):_____19___

(b) Were Unit Leaders assigned for the whole school year?.....Yes___ No___

(c) Did you directly select the Unit Leaders for this year?.....Yes___ No___

If YES, please indicate the criteria employed. While you may have considered most or all of the characteristics below, you likely made decisions on the basis of the most important ones. Which were these? That is, which of these were your highest priorities in selecting Unit Leaders? Please check no more than five.

___ (a) general teaching experience (length & variety) and commitment
___ (b) experience in team teaching or other cooperative planning
___ (c) professional rapport with teaching associates
___ (d) imaginativeness and flexibility in use of methods & materials
___ (e) experience in teaching with individualized materials or systems
___ (f) graduate degree and/or study
___ (g) request to be considered for the unit leader role
___ (h) energy and enthusiasm
___ (i) subject matter strength(s)
___ (j) seniority
___ (k) generally the "best teacher" of a given grade level
___ (l) rapport with the principal
___ (m) degree of commitment to MUSE and IGE patterns
___ (n) effective disciplinarian

___ (o) (OTHER) _____

If NO, indicate what method was employed for choosing unit leaders:

3. Do you plan to replace any Unit Leaders for next school year?..... Yes___ No__
If YES, (a) How many such changes? _____
(b) Why are such changes being planned? _____

_____

4. Rating Unit Leaders on various role aspects.
Considering activities and performance at this time, please indicate the number of unit leaders you would rank as doing poorly, adequately, and well. For example, assuming 5 unit leaders, you might rate them as follows on a given task:
1 performs poorly, 2 adequately, and 2 well...at this time.

Total Number of Unit Leaders: _____

	Number of Unit Leade		
	POORLY	ADE-QUATELY	WE
(a) Is efficient in discovering and utilizing resources: staff, space, materials, assistance			
(b) Performs liaison functions between the unit (its concerns & needs) and the IIC and principal			
(c) Assists interns, student-teachers, aides, and new teachers in their unit roles			
(d) Evokes positive attitudes toward new methods, new materials, and curricular & instructional changes			
(e) Plans and carries out the instructional program in the unit for the IGE subject(s)			
(f) Maintains effective communication with parents			
(g) Conducts constructive unit meetings, including planning, in-service, problem-solving			
(h) Contributes meaningfully (through the IIC) to the educational program of the whole school			
(i) Demonstrates and practices good teaching approaches			
(j) Makes use of opportunities to perfect his/her skills			
(k) Monitors and coordinates all the aspects of the unit as a "school within the school"			

5. What are 2 or 3 major, overriding goals that you, as principal, set for this school year? And to what extent do you feel that they have been accomplished?

	Accomplishment to Date		
	Little	Partial	Complet
(a)_____			
(b)_____			
(c)_____			

An important aspect of MUSE/IGE preparation and implementation is the "training received by staff members. We know that localities and states--as well as individuals--have had different kinds and amounts of such training and exposure, and would like to get a sense of your reactions to whatever has been your experience.

(a) IN GENERAL, how do you rate your overall training and exposure up to now in terms of its adequacy in

1. Preparing you for--and assisting you in--taking on your new role in this year's implementation?...
2. Informing you about the multiunit structure, purposes and operations?.....
3. Informing you about the purposes and procedures of individually-guided education?.....

(b) How do you rate your school's in-service program in terms of its being adequate to your needs this year?.

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor
1.					
2.					
3.					
(b)					

If you could set up a workshop of your own devising right now, what would its purpose and topic be?

_____

_____

If there are weaknesses in the whole training design, what one weakness stands out in your mind?

_____

Compared with your actual experience in training and exposure, would you prefer to have had more....

	YES	NO
(a) training prior to MUSE/IGE implementation?.....		
(b) training during MUSE/IGE implementation?.....		
(c) contact with "outside" consultants?.....		
(d) practical "how-to-do-it" training?.....		
(e) opportunity to develop & discuss plans?.....		

Please indicate your personal reaction concerning implementation "success" in your school at this time.

I feel that...

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor
(a) implementation of the multiunit structure has been...					
(b) implementation of the IGE instructional model in _____(name subject area) has been.....					
_____(name subject area) has been.....					

If you were going to advise a school considering "going IGE/MUSE" next year, what would your single most important piece of advice be? Please be candid.

_____

_____

Please indicate your general personal feeling about the multiunit school concepts (MUSE) and individually-guided education (IGE). Check one item on the scale for the beginning of the school year, and one for now, for both MUSE and IGE.

		CAUTIOUS	NEUTRAL	AGREEABLE	ENTHUSIASTIC
MUSE	(a) Beginning				
	(b) Now				
IGE	(c) Beginning				
	(d) Now				

6. Briefly list 2 or 3 major, overall goals which you have set for next school year if they differ from those set for this year.

(a) _____

(b) _____

(c) _____

7. Selection and assignment of staff teachers

(a) How were staff teachers grouped into the several units?
___ assigned to units by principal
___ chosen by the unit leaders
___ self-selected by staff teachers
___ grouped automatically by number of teachers in given grade levels
___ (Other)_____

(b) Do you feel that the method used was satisfactory?.....Yes___ No___

(c) Was there opportunity to assess the wishes and competencies of teachers with respect to working in the new MUSE/IGE patterns?....Yes___ No___

(d) Was a means provided for teachers to indicate their commitment to the new patterns and plans?.....Yes___ No___

(e) Where teachers were not fully committed or "ready," we have been able to be flexible and have provided for...
___ separate self-contained classroom
___ delay of IGE subject in a room or unit
___ departmentalization

___ (Other)_____

8. As principal, do you now do more of any of the following than before your school installed MUSE/IGE? Please check all that apply.

___ (a) attending meetings of professional groups
___ (b) supervising educational programs and practices in the school
___ (c) directing in-service and pre-service training of teachers
___ (d) teaching children
___ (e) delegating instructional and curricular decisions
___ (f) encouraging classroom exploration and experimentation
___ (g) handling discipline problems
___ (h) meeting with, and explaining the school program to, parents
___ (i) dealing with varied personnel problems
___ (j) evaluating "performance" of teachers, paraprofessionals, and others
___ (k) taking care of routine school management matters
___ (l) securing consultant and other specialized help for the school program
___ (m) having meetings of the full school staff
___ (n) consulting with key staff in the solution of educational problems

9. From your point of view as Principal, which of the following have given particular difficulty this year in installing MUSE/IGE? Please check all applicable items, but only if these have been continuing or serious problems to effective implementation.

___ (a) Ineffective leadership of some or all unit leaders
___ (b) Confusion over new roles and responsibilities
___ (c) Teachers working too hard and long; "burn-out"
___ (d) A sizable number of teachers not fully committed to MUSE and IGE
___ (e) Availability of effective consulting assistance from outside the school
___ (f) Resistance to idea of teaching multiage groups of students
___ (g) Problems in teamwork, planning, & sharing within any or all units
___ (h) Departmentalization of instruction in the units
___ (i) Problems in communication in the school: between units; access to the principal; teachers and the IIC; staff meetings; attitudes
___ (j) Problems in IMC: materials, staffing, space, and accessibility
___ (k) Problems in in-service training: content, frequency, time, relevance
___ (l) Competition among the units

___ (m) (Other) _____

10. How do you define the "beginning point" of your installation of MUSE/IGE this year? That is, what event or circumstance marks the point before which you were in the planning and preparation period but after which you would say that your school was actually a "MUSE/IGE school?" Please check one choice below, or indicate a more precise one under "Other."

___ (a) Decision by school staff to be committed to MUSE/IGE
___ (b) Selection of the Unit Leaders
___ (c) First regular meeting of the IIC
___ (d) Choice of subject-area(s) for IGE
___ (e) Organization of teachers and students into functioning units
___ (f) Initiation of the Wisconsin Reading Design: assessment of pupil status
___ (g) Initiation of other individualized curriculum: assessment of pupil status
___ (h) Preschool Workshop for the school staff
___ (i) Development of the IMC or Learning Center or Media Center
___ (j) Initiation of in-service training
___ (k) Initiation of team functions (planning, sharing, teaching) in the units
___ (l) Delineation of general or specific objectives in IGE subject-area(s)

___ (m) (Other) _____

11. If there is anything about this year's installation which is important (or of interest) which we haven't asked about, please add any notes here. You may want to expand on certain responses given for the questions above or indicate certain aspects of your plans for next school year.

_____

_____

_____

_____

O.M.B. No. 51-S-72023
Approval expires 12-31-72.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ALL UNIT TEACHERS (Individually)

* Unit (Name or number _____)	* Unit age-levels: _____ to _____
*Check here if you are a unit leader: _____)	* or grade-levels: _____ to _____

1. Before your school implemented MUSE/IGE, did you have an opportunity to discuss the plans and rationale of these new patterns, and also the implications for changes associated with these patterns?.....Yes___ No___

2. Did you have the option of transferring to another school?.....Yes___ No___

3. What is your feeling about each of the following items? Indicate whether your general feeling is positive, neutral, or negative concerning each separate item... whether or not all of these were practiced in your school this year.

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT...?	POSI-TIVE	NEU-TRAL	NEGA-TIVE
a. The size of your unit's student body			
b. The size of your unit's teaching staff			
c. Teaching small and medium-sized groups (3 to 11) (12 to 19)			
d. Teaching large groups (30 or more students)			
e. All teachers teaching all the students in the unit			
f. All teachers teaching all the subject-areas			
g. Having all or most teaching materials in one location			
h. Keeping records in IGE and recording pupils' progress			
i. Making plans and decisions with other unit teachers			
j. Having school-wide in-service training on MUSE and IGE			
k. Having unit in-service training on MUSE and IGE			
l. Having a full- or part-time aide on the unit staff			
m. Departmentalization within the unit			
n. One teacher as resource person for a subject-area or instructional unit, with others also teaching			
o. Assessing students' detailed attainments and needs			
p. Having pupils of a 2- or 3-year age range within the unit			
q. Evaluating students in terms of continuous progress			
r. Having self-contained classrooms within the unit			
s. Regrouping children every few weeks for instruction, based on progress and needs			
t. (Other)			

(4.) This item relates to your regularly scheduled teaching activities in the unit. Check the one statement below which best describes your teaching activities. If none is satisfactory, please describe under "Other."

___ (a) teaching various groups of students, where the students are multiaged all or most of the time
___ (b) teaching various groups of students, where students are of the same age and in the same grade
___ (c) teaching a particular group in the unit, where students are multiaged; in effect, a group within the unit or a self-contained class
___ (d) teaching a particular group, where students are of the same age and grade; in effect, a group within the unit or a self-contained class

___ (e) (OTHER) _____

(5.) Of all the students in your unit, what percentage do you have regularly scheduled instructional contact with?..... About _____%

(6.) Is there a particular group of students in the unit who are "yours?" Yes___No___

If YES, (a) please check the appropriate item(s) below which explain this.

___ (a) homeroom group (at start of day and perhaps at end of day)
___ (b) for parent contact, parent-conferences, and reporting progress
___ (c) for monitoring their total school experience; guidance
___ (d) a particular group you teach daily in a given subject-area
___ (e) classroom group (self-contained) which you teach most of the day

___ (f) (OTHER) _____

(b) How large is this group? _____ students

(7.) In general, if you could set up the program for next year, which of the following proportions of time would be your personal preference for "doing things as a unit?"
Check one.

AMOUNT OF TIME

All	Most	About Half	Some	Very Little

8. Here is a list of activities and outcomes which might characterize the functions of the IIC. Based on your personal opinion at this time, please indicate how well you feel each has been done this year. If an item does not apply, leave it blank.

The IIC...	Poorly	Ade-quately	Well
a. coordinates the in-service program of the school			
b. helps in resolving the individual units' problems			
c. coordinates the school's total instructional program			
d. improves staff communications within the total school			
e. coordinates the use of space, equipment, materials, and facilities among the units			
f. coordinates the informing and contacting of parents			
g. locates and acquires needed instructional materials			
h. takes the place of the traditional teachers' meeting			
i. (OTHER)			

9. (a) Up to now, have you been a resource person in the unit for any of the following? That is, have you taken on a "speciality" of sorts this year within the unit?

___ (a) a subject-matter area, on a permanent basis
___ (b) a subject-matter area for instructional units
___ (c) assessment of student needs, performance, and progress
___ (d) teaching methods in class-sized or large groups
___ (e) teaching methods in medium, small, or tutorial groups
___ (f) plans and methods for grouping unit children for instruction
___ (g) preparing and/or gathering performance objectives
___ (h) developing or gathering instructional materials
___ (i) relating to parents and answering parent information-needs

___ (j) (OTHER)_____

(b) Do you plan and/or teach a subject area in more than one unit and thus serve as a specialist for the school?..... Yes___ No___

(c) Do you have any other "speciality" or especially-assigned task for the school as a whole?..... Yes___ No___
If YES, please describe that role.

_____

_____

A. An important aspect of MUSE/IGE preparation and implementation is the "training received by staff members. We know that localities and states--as well as individuals--have had different kinds and amounts of such training and exposure, and would like to get a sense of your reactions to whatever has been your experience.

1. (a) IN GENERAL, how do you rate your overall training and exposure up to now in terms of its adequacy in

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor
1. Preparing you for--and assisting you in--taking on your new role in this year's implementation?...					
2. Informing you about the multiunit structure, purposes and operations?.....					
3. Informing you about the purposes and procedures of individually-guided education?.....					
(b) How do you rate your school's in-service program in terms of its being adequate to your needs this year?.					

2. If you could set up a workshop of your own devising right now, what would its purpose and topic be?

_____

_____

3. If there are weaknesses in the whole training design, what one weakness stands out in your mind?

_____

4. Compared with your actual experience in training and exposure, would you prefer to have had more....

	YES	NO
(a) training prior to MUSE/IGE implementation?.....		
(b) training during MUSE/IGE implementation?.....		
(c) contact with "outside" consultants?.....		
(d) practical "how-to-do-it" training?.....		
(e) opportunity to develop & discuss plans?.....		

B. Please indicate your personal reaction concerning implementation "success" in your school at this time.

I feel that...

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor
(a) implementation of the multiunit structure has been...					
(b) implementation of the IGE instructional model in _____(name subject area) has been.....					
_____(name subject area) has been.....					

C. If you were going to advise a school considering "going IGE/MUSE" next year, what would your single most important piece of advice be? Please be candid.

_____

_____

D. Please indicate your general personal feeling about the multiunit school concepts (MUSE) and individually-guided education (IGE). Check one item on the scale for the beginning of the school year, and one for now, for both MUSE and IGE.

		CAUTIOUS	NEUTRAL	AGREEABLE	ENTHUSIASTIC
MUSE	(a) Beginning				
	(b) Now				
IGE	(c) Beginning				
	(d) Now				

O.M.B. No. 51-S-72023
Approval expires 12-31-72.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EACH UNIT -- (AS A GROUP ACTIVITY)

Unit (Name or number) _____	Unit age levels: _____to_____ or grade-levels:_____to_____

1.) UNIT MEETINGS

(a) When did you begin your formal unit meetings? (month & year) _____19___
(b) How much scheduled unit meeting time do you have per week? _____hours
(c) In which way do you use this time? Please check.

___ almost totally for team planning, discussion, work on materials, grouping, etc.
___ partly for such team activities and partly for individual teacher preparation
___ almost totally for individual teacher preparation

(d) For these meetings, do you almost always have a prepared agenda?..Yes___ No___
(e) Are Unit meeting minutes recorded and distributed to unit staff?..Yes___ No___
(f) Do aides (and student teachers) regularly attend unit meetings?...Yes___ No___
(g) How frequently does the principal attend your unit meetings?

Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Always

2.) Do you have in-service training of any sort just within your unit?....Yes___ No___
If YES, please indicate...

(a) about how many times this school year? _____
(b) for about how long each time? _____
(c) has this occurred during regular "unit-meeting" time?.....Yes___ No___
(d) have you used any of the I/D/E/A filmstrips and cassettes?..Yes___ No___
(e) have you used any of the I/D/E/A films?.....Yes___ No___
(f) have you used the I/D/E/A booklets "Unit Operations and Roles" or "The Learning Program?".....Yes___ No___
(g) have you used any film or filmstrip more than once?.....Yes___ No___
(h) have the sessions sometimes focused on an individualized curriculum: its content, materials, & sequence?.....Yes___ No___
(i) have the sessions sometimes focused on various teaching styles and learning styles in the IGE setting?.....Yes___ No___
(j) have the sessions sometimes focused on unit operations?.....Yes___ No___
(k) generally, do you as a group feel that this unit-level in-service has been beneficial?.....Yes___ No___
(l) do you plan to continue such in-service next year?.....Yes___ No___

If NO, do you plan to have "unit in-service" next year?.....Yes___ No___

3. Do you have an IGE subject-area at this time?.....Yes___ No__
If YES, please describe the current teaching operation in your unit in terms of the questions below. If you are implementing IGE in a second subject, use column B to record instructional practices.

	A		B	
	Subject #1		Subject #2	
(a) What is the IGE subject-area?.....				
(b) When did you initiate this subject along IGE lines in your unit? (month & year).....				
	YES	NO	YES	NO
(c) Have you assessed pupil performance and needs in terms of behavioral objectives in the IGE subject?..				
(d) Have you grouped children for instruction in terms of overall ability (e.g., high, medium, and low) groups?.....				
(e) Have you grouped children for instruction in terms of common specific instructional needs they have?...				
(f) Do you typically regroup the children as they progress in the subject-area?.....				
If YES, how frequently is this done? About every...	weeks		weeks	
(g) Do all teachers in the unit teach this IGE subject to some extent and on a regular basis?.....				
(h) Does the unit have a large block of time (from 1-1/2 to 3 hours) set aside to allow flexible teaching of the IGE subject?.....				
(i) After initiating the subject, have you worked continuously with it up to now?.....				
(j) In planning for initiation of the subject in your unit, did you develop an implementation timetable?.....				
(k) Does any District or school specialist in the subject-area work directly in and with your unit?..				
If YES, how frequently? (in general terms).....				
Does the specialist sometimes teach the children?.....				

Question 3 Continued

	A Subject #1 Check One	B Subject #2 Check One
(l) In teaching the IGE subject, which one of the following is most typical in your unit as a whole?		
- teaching given groups of 20 to 30 students on a regular basis.....		
- teaching groups of any size based on general ability levels, and teaching such groups on a regular basis..		
- supervising each child in an individualized system (working on his own), regardless of the number of students involved at any given time.....		
- teaching groups of changing composition and size (including tutorial, independent study; small, medium, class-size, and large groups), based upon periodic reassessment and regrouping.....		

	A Check One	B Check One
(m) Which one of the following types of instructional materials do you use most consistently?		
- a specific textbook or basal reader.....		
- a variety of textbooks and materials.....		
- a published set of materials that amounts to an individualized system or program.....		
(If it is the latter, please indicate the name of the published system or program).....		

4. Please describe your unit's current overall instructional pattern below.

(a) Total number of regular teachers in the unit: _____ (not aides or others)

(b) Total number of students in the unit: _____

(c) How many unit teachers (not aides or others) currently teach the given subjects? Please indicate the number of teachers next to each subject-area.

_____ teachers teach mathematics
_____ teachers teach science
_____ teachers teach reading
_____ teachers teach language arts
_____ teachers teach health
_____ teachers teach social studies
_____ teachers teach writing

_____ teachers teach _____

_____ teachers teach _____

5. Do you have a full- or part-time paid aide in your unit?.....Yes___ No___
If YES, please check the statements which apply:

___ (a) has had formal training as an aide If so, when? _____
For how long? _____
___ (b) has clearly defined responsibilities in the unit
___ (c) has a wide range of tasks in and for the unit
___ (d) assigned tasks include definite instructional activities with children
___ (e) is evaluated by the unit staff and/or principal
___ (f) usually attends the unit meetings
___ (g) is included in in-service training we have as a unit
___ (h) attends school-wide in-service training sessions
___ (i) is an aide whom we hope we will have again next year
___ (j) is kept very busy by unit needs

6. Do you have volunteer aide(s) in your unit, on a regularly scheduled basis?.....Yes___No___

7. PARENT CONTACT
(a) Have you had particular programs, meetings, or other contacts with parents of your unit in order to inform them of MUSE/IGE and explain new procedures? If so, please describe these activities briefly:

_____

_____

8. Please check any of the following ways in which the IIC has assisted your unit in the instructional domain this year.
The IIC has assisted us in...

___ (a) working out scheduling problems of various sorts
___ (b) finding or developing performance objectives
___ (c) suggesting or developing criterion-referenced tests
___ (d) perfecting plans for instructional programing in the IGE subject
___ (e) securing consultants to aid the unit in planning or teaching
___ (f) developing ways of keeping records on pupil achievement and needs

___ (g) (OTHER)_____

___ (h) (OTHER)_____

O.M.B. No. 51-S-72023
Approval expires 12-31-72.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE IIC
(Group Activity)

In this series of instruments, we are attempting to obtain--from a sample of 1971-72 multiunit schools--several sorts of information: (a) descriptive data concerning the process of implementation and accompanying problems; (b) feedback data across schools which will help in next year's installation in several states; (c) indications of attitudes and reactions toward various aspects of training, implementation, and "MUSE/IGE in action."

Questionnaires have been prepared for the following groups and individuals in each sample school: principal, IIC, IMC Director/librarian, each unit as a unit, and all unit teachers individually, and IGE subject specialist.

The instrument for the IIC is the longest one, and an important one. Please note, however, that nearly every item asks for a rating or a series of check-marks. Between 1/2 hour and an hour of the IIC's meeting time would be needed. In completing the form, please involve only regular IIC members.

1. There are many potentially new features and practices in the MUSE/IGE patterns, and also various persons with stated or developing responsibilities. We are asking school personnel to help us discover common practices across schools during this year. Please indicate which person or group (to the right) performs the particular activity or typically makes the related decisions in your school situation. Please respond in terms of present practice and policy. Omit any which do not apply.

Check one or more persons or groups for a particular item, as appropriate.

P=Principal UL=Unit Leader
IIC=Instructional Improvement Committee

	PERSON OR GROUP				
	P	IIC	UL	UNIT	OTHER (Please indicate)
a. Choice of IGE subject is made by...					
b. Whether or not all teachers will teach the IGE subject(s) to some extent is decided by...					
c. Decisions as to what subjects each teacher will teach are made by...					
d. Makeup of unit teaching staff is decided by					
e. Unit instructional schedules are set by...					
f. Selection of paid aides is made by...					
g. Aides' duties & roles are determined by...					
h. Selection of materials for IMC is made by...					
i. Where and when students may study or work outside actual unit room(s) is set by...					
j. Content & agendas of unit meetings are set by					
k. Regular communication with parents (contact, information, feedback) is decided by...					
l. Content and frequency of school-wide in-service training is decided by...					
m. Staff attendance at in-service & other activities away from the school is decided by					
n. Content and frequency of in-service training within the unit is decided by...					
o. Forms or systems for recording student progress and needs are determined by...					
p. Means and frequency of reporting pupil progress to parents are decided by...					

(2.) The IIC Meetings:

a. The IIC regularly meets for _____ hours per week.
b. Who serves as IIC chairman? (Position, not name)_____
c. Is an agenda regularly prepared for IIC meetings?.....Yes___No___

If YES, is it printed in advance?.....Yes___No___

d. Does the IIC keep a formal log or set of minutes?.....Yes___No___
e. Are minutes or reports of IIC meetings generally distributed after meetings?.....Yes___No___

If YES, to whom? Please check:

___unit leaders
___IMC director or librarian
___staff teachers
___special teachers
___District liaison or coordinator
___(Other)_____

f. Do you sometimes request non-IIC members to attend?.....Yes___No___
g. Do you evaluate your IIC meetings, or IIC activities and functions?....Yes___No___

If YES,.... occasionally [ ] or frequently [ ]

h. When was the IIC set up? (month & year) _____19___
i. When did the IIC actually begin functioning as the "governing group" for the school's instructional program? (month & year) _____19___

(3.) Roughly what percentage of the IIC time has been devoted to the following broad activities this year? (To the nearest 5% or 10%).

___ (a) Monitoring IGE implementation in the school and evaluating progress
___ (b) Dealing with, explaining to, or getting support of--parents
___ (c) Aiding the units in instructional programing in IGE subject(s), and related assistance such as materials and recording pupil progress
___ (d) Planning and arranging in-service training for the whole staff
___ (e) General management of the school and personnel relations
___ (f) Planning (of all sorts) for 1972-73 operations

___ (g) (Other)_____
100%

(4.) After students and teachers were assigned to given units, when did they actually begin to operate as instructional units?
(a) If all units began operation at the same time, please indicate month and year: _____19___
(b) If units began actual operation at different times during the year, please indicate month and year for each unit:

Unit (name or number)	Date
	19
	19
	19
	19

Unit (name or number)	Date
	19
	19
	19
	19

5. Any or all of the following topics may present problems to a school in the process of embracing MUSE and IGE patterns. This wide range is based on feedback obtained from schools engaged in implementation. As the IIC group, please consider this list carefully and mark it in 3 different ways in the columns to the right.

Column A: Check any of the following which have been really nettlesome during this school year--items which have presented troublesome obstacles to a smooth transition and implementation of MUSE/IGE.

Column B: Of those items checked in Column A, check the four which have been the most serious in your school's implementation this year.

Column C: Of those items checked in Column A, check the ones which the IIC has grappled with and resolved--or has made significant progress with--in this first year.

NOTE: Please check items in Columns B and C only if you marked them in Column A.

	A Trouble-Some	B 4 Most Serious	C Cope & Progress
1. Keeping records and recording student progress for IGE			
2. Stating instructional objectives in behavioral terms			
3. Grouping students for instruction			
4. Multiage grouping in rooms, classes, or units			
5. Assessment of students' achievement states and needs			
6. Working on two or more IGE subjects			
7. Implementing the IGE instructional programing model			
8. Teaching all the various sizes of instructional groups			
9. Level of support/cooperation from parents			
0. Level of support/cooperation from district personnel			
1. Reporting and explaining to parents & community			
2. Overall school schedules and separate unit schedules			
3. Time available for planning, grouping, evaluating, & preparation--in the units			
4. Teachers knowing & working with up to 150 students			
5. Costs for staff, materials, construction, training			
6. Time for in-service training			
7. Coordination of use of space, materials, staff			
8. Roles and responsibilities of aides			
9. Daily moving of students & teachers within units			
0. Discipline, noise, confusion			
1. Nature of the building(s), layout, space; doors			
2. Materials and equipment in the IMC/library			
3. Location of IMC/library; accessibility & size			
4. Outside assistance for consultation & in-service			
5. Supply of large variety of teaching materials			
6. Size of unit staffs			
7. Children's adjustments to the new routines			
8. Scheduling special teachers (art, phys. ed, etc.) into the instructional programs of the units			
9. (Other)			
0. (Other)			

6. Has your school--at any time--developed an overall MUSE/IGE "implementation timetable?".....Yes___ No___
If YES, (a) When was this formally done? _____19___

(b) By what person or group?_____
(c) Has it since been revised?.....Yes___ No___
(d) Do you feel that you are...(check one)
___ ahead of the timetable schedule
___ behind the timetable schedule
___ about on the anticipated schedule
(e) Was any "implementation guide" (listed in the question below) used in developing your timetable?.....Yes___ No___

If NO, are you planning to develop one for next year?.....Yes___ No___

7. As a guide to the sequence of activities and the nature of various personnel responsibilities in installing MUSE/IGE, are you using an "implementation guide" at this time?.....Yes___ No___
If YES, (a) which are you using?

___"IGE Implementation Guide" I/D/E/A, 1970.

___"Individually Guided Education and the Multiunit Elementary School: Education for the 70's" Wisconsin R & D Center, 1970. ("blue book")

___"Performance Objectives for Implementation of IGE/MUS-E" Wisconsin R & D Center, 1971 (color-coded)

___"Performance Objectives for Implementation of IGE/MUS-E" Wisconsin R & D Center, 1972. Revised Version (color-coded)

(b) How are you using such guide(s)? Check all that apply.
___ (a) Reference source, as an implementation aid for ideas
___ (b) Checklist for completed activities
___ (c) Record of projected dates, dates of accomplishment, means used, or plans for accomplishment
___ (d) As a way of assessing status and progress

___ (e) (Other)_____

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor
(c) How do you rate the guide's overall usefulness in terms of providing or clarifying long-range goals and the "total picture" of MUSE/IGE?					
(d) How do you rate the guide's overall usefulness as an aid in first-year implementation of MUSE/IGE?.....					

Additional Comment: _____

_____

3.) The following list contains a number of items related to instructional assignments within units, and other unit activities. Please mark these as follows.

Column A: Indicate which statements represent goals and expectations for your school as either formal or informal "policy."

THEN, of those topics checked as goals in Column A, indicate current practice or plans by checking either Column A or Column B.

Column B: Indicate which practices are currently in operation.
or
Column C: Indicate those practices for which you have fairly concrete implementation plans (for next school year).

Note: Please check items in Column B or Column C only if you marked them in Column A.

	A Goals	B Current	C Plans
1. All units adopt the same IGE subject-area(s).			
2. Each teacher teaches all regular subject areas to some extent.			
3. Each teacher teaches the chosen IGE subject-matter area(s) to some extent.			
4. Each teacher teaches all (or virtually all) students in the unit			
5. One teacher takes responsibility for planning and leading a particular instructional unit, and other teachers assist, support, and teach in various ways; in other instructional units (or subject areas), different teachers take the lead.			
6. In a typical week, each unit provides the following groupings in the IGE subject-area: One-to-one (pupil & pupil and teacher & pupil) Small group (3 to 11 students); Medium (12 to 19 students) Class-sized group (20 to 30 students); Large (more than 30)			
7. A given teacher spends most of his/her teaching time with one or two of the instructional groups listed above, and thus is a specialist of sorts within the unit.			
8. The IGE subject area in the units is presented along the lines of the "instructional programing model."			
9. Each teacher has a particular group of children to whom he/she relates as a parent-contact, a "home-base" in the school, or a monitor of the pupil's overall progress.			
10. Unit Leaders have a somewhat lighter weekly teaching load than staff teachers in the unit.			
11. Units submit their detailed implementation plans (for the IGE subject area) to the IIC for review.			
12. Unit agendas and minutes are presented for IIC review.			
13. Units have prescribed times set aside for formal unit meetings.			
14. In a systematic way, units keep informed of other units' activities.			
15. Unit meetings are sometimes evaluated or studied by the IIC.			
16. Kindergarten and primary levels are integrated functionally into a unit, with multiage instruction.			

9. IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR YOUR SCHOOL

As accurately as you easily can, please answer the following questions concerning in-service training for the whole school staff this school year.

(a) Since the implementation of MUSE/IGE began this year, about how many hours of schoolwide in-service training have you had? Check one, please.

___up to 5 hours
___6 to 10 hours
___11 to 20 hours
___21 or more hours

(b) For these hours of in-service, check the categories below of persons who are typically present; that is, who have attended all or most of the training sessions.

___principal
___unit leaders
___staff teachers
___aides
___IMC Director/ librarian
___special subject teachers
___interns, student-teachers
___special teachers for IGE subject-area(s)

(c) Approximately what percentages of total in-service training have been devoted to these major areas? (To the nearest 5% or 10%).

___ (a) the methods and materials of your IGE subject(s)
___ (b) strategies for improving various aspects of the multiunit organization
___ (c) strategies for implementing the instructional programing model
___ (d) general teaching methods, acquaintance with new materials, evaluation
___ (e) human relations and techniques for decision-making

100%

(d) In general, to what extent have you used the I/D/E/A booklets, films, and filmstrip/cassettes in this in-service training? Please indicate such use for the period after beginning the MUSE/IGE implementation. Check one.

Often	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never

(e) Has any such in-service session been conducted by, (or has it featured),...
___a consultant from either the Wisconsin R & D Center or I/D/E/A/?....Yes___No___
___a consultant from the State Department of Education?.....Yes___No___

10. OTHER TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

Besides in-service training for the school staff, have representatives of your school participated in these other training activities? Check those which have been attended by staff members.

___ (a) League- (or Pact- or Network-) sponsored training or conferences for...

___principals
___unit leaders
___ all teachers
___aides
___total school staffs
___IMC Directors/librarians

___ (b) Local or regional meetings where 2 or more schools joined forces in an informal way

___ (c) Visits to other MUSE/IGE schools

___ (d) (Other)_____

1.) Here is a list of potential sources of assistance in smooth implementation and in the solution of installation problems. These are in addition to the "implementation guides" referred to above, and include both persons and materials.

Please rate these resources in terms of their overall usefulness (materials) or their assistance (persons or agencies) during this school year. In cases where you may not have used or called on these resources, check "does not apply."

	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Fair	Poor	Does Not Apply
I/D/E/A booklet "Principal's Handbook"						
" "Unit Operations & Roles"						
" "The Learning Program"						
I/D/E/A films						
I/D/E/A filmstrips and cassettes						
R & D Center "Resource File" (1972) with simulation, sample agendas, sample plans						
Publications of your linkage (League or Pact)						
Consultants from District central office						
Formal state or regional linkages of schools (league, pact, network, or other system)						
State coordinator or associated staff						
Consultant-visitors from Wisconsin R&D Center						
District general policy or steering committee for MUSE/IGE installation						
Consultant-visitors from I/D/E/A-Kettering						
Staff of nearby schools						
Local (district) coordinator or liaison						
Consultants from State Department of Education						
College or university consultants						

2.) Have you supplied feedback directly to any person or group associated with MUSE/IGE? Feedback here refers to accounting information, lists of needs, explanatory materials, or records of functions and actions taken. Please indicate to whom you have submitted such feedback and whether formally or informally.

Person or Group	Formal Systematic Feedback	Informal Casual Feedback
Systemwide Policy Committee (or other District governing group)		
District administration		
I/D/E/A (Kettering)		
Wisconsin R & D Center		
State (or large city-area) Coordinator		
District MUSE/IGE coordinator (or liaison)		
School Board		
Linkage group (League, Pact, Network, or other such group)		
(Other)_____		

(13.) Schools are implementing MUSE and IGE in different ways and on different schedules. As an aid in summarizing certain overall practices across schools this year, please answer each item below with a yes or no, indicating present operations and features of your school's MUSE/IGE implementation.

	YES	NO
1. (a) Do you hold regular IIC meetings on a scheduled basis?.....		
(b) Does the IIC make decisions concerning the instructional program?.....		
2. (a) Is the IMC/library adequately stocked with instructional material?.....		
(b) Is the IMC/library being "used to capacity" by students & teachers?.....		
3. (a) In general, do teachers in the units take on different roles within the units (differentiated staffing)?.....		
(b) Are paraprofessionals contributing to the instructional program?.....		
4. (a) Are lines of communication in the school "open?".....		
(b) Are teachers' concerns and needs considered by the IIC and principal?...		
5. (a) Are your units multiaged (with a 2 to 4 year spread)?.....		
(b) Within the units, is instruction itself typically directed to multiaged groups of children?.....		
6. (a) Has MUSE/IGE changed the principal's role to one of increased participation in the instructional program?.....		
(b) Has the principal been able to encourage teachers to experiment with different instructional approaches?.....		
7. (a) Do you have at least one IGE subject at this time?.....		
(b) Is it being implemented in all the units?.....		
(c) Is the "instructional programing model" being followed in all the units with respect to the IGE subject?.....		
8. (a) In general, are the units functioning as "working groups?" That is, are the unit staffs doing cooperative planning and teaching?.....		
(b) Do most teachers appear content with their "teammates?".....		
9. (a) Is your school fully unitized at this time? That is, are all students and regular classroom teachers in units?.....		
(b) Is the Kindergarten instructionally integrated with a primary unit?.....		
10. (a) Are unit leaders focusing unit attention on the IGE subject and the instructional programing model?.....		
(b) In general, are unit leaders finding it easy to encourage or assign a variety of teaching responsibilities in the units?.....		
11. (a) On the whole, does the school staff appear to be "sold" on the idea of the multiunit school structure?.....		
(b) Is there a general atmosphere of commitment to individualized education among teachers at this time?.....		
12. (a) Do you have periodic or regularly scheduled in-service training for the whole school staff?.....		
(b) Have school representatives attended various sorts of training and conferences sponsored by agencies outside the school?.....		
(c) Have you called on other resources or consultants for assistance?.....		

APPENDIX G

Visit Report Forms

School _____ Visitor _____ OBSERVATION AND INTERVIEW
Date(s) of visit _____ MULTIUNIT SCHOOL

The three basic "operations" about which we need visit information are (1) the multiunit school, its organization, its planning procedures, its differences from the traditional school in the millieu it provides, (2) the type and extent of individually-guided education it engages in for children, and (3) the extent and nature of training which is provided by and for the staff. Both of these are in terms of the date of the visit, the status quo, but we are also interested in noting present plans for further changes as well as in learning about factors that led up to adoption of these patterns. So, we must think in terms of what should be pursued and noted in subsequent visits.

Please consult "draft outline" (10-12-71) and memo of 10-18 for other detailed notes and reminders.

INTERVIEWS Interviews were conducted with the following persons; indicate how many in each category and approximate length of time for each person.

#		#	
___	Principal _____	___	Unit Leaders _____
___	Librarian or IMC Director _____	___	Staff Teachers _____
___	District coordinator or consultant _____	___	Aides _____
___	State coordinator _____	___	Interns, student teachers _____
___	(other) _____	___	Students _____
		___	(other) _____

PRINTED MATERIALS The following were acquired or examined.

Acquired, & Attached To Report	Studied, & Summarized In Report	
___	___	IMC agenda(s)
___	___	* Letter(s) to parents concerning the new patterns
___	___	IMC log or journal
___	___	* Agendas or outlines of in-service training so far
___	___	Overviews of MUSE/IGE (for teachers, parents, others)
___	___	* School schedules (probably by week)
___	___	Reports or other feedback to coordinator, R & D, or...
___	___	Record forms for pupil status, needs, progress
___	___	Report card forms
___	___	Local "evaluation" forms or plans
___	___	* Outline of units (Ss, personnel, "grades", etc.)
___	___	_____
___	___	_____
___	___	* Curricular content and/or objectives for the year, the whole school, or given subject area(s). (Specify) _____

Characterize ease of access to materials:

* If unable to get or see copies of these, report your findings in detail from interviews on these topics: either what has been done or is now being planned.

8S3

OBSERVATION Check those observed or attended; add other information.

1. ___ IIC meeting. Lasted ___ hours. Printed agenda in advance? ___
(Meetings are regularly scheduled for ___ hours total, per week).

Who attended today?
___ principal
___ unit leaders (N=)
___ reading (math) consultant
___ (other) _____
___ staff teachers (N=)
___ IMC director
___ librarian
___ (other) _____

(a) Indicate with * any of those attending who are NOT regular members of the IIC.

(b) On separate sheet, describe content, purposes, interactions, decisions, plans, problems, as observed in IIC.

---

2. ___ Unit meeting of Unit _____. Lasted ___ hours. Prepared agenda? ___
(Meetings are regularly scheduled for ___ hours total, per week).
(In addition, each staff teacher has ___ hours weekly planning time. And the unit leader has ___ hours weekly personal planning time).

Who attended today?
___ unit leader
___ staff teachers (N=)
___ aides (N=)
___ interns, student teachers (N=)
___ principal
___ consultant (_____)
___ (other) _____
___ " _____

(a) Indicate with * any attending who are NOT regular members.

(b) On separate sheet, describe content, purpose, interactions, decisions, plans, problems, as observed in Unit meeting.

---

3. ___ Unit meeting of Unit _____. Lasted ___ hours. Prepared agenda? ___
(Meetings are regularly scheduled for ___ hours total, per week).
(In addition, each staff teacher has ___ hours weekly planning time. And the unit leader has ___ hours weekly personal planning time).

Who attended today?
___ unit leader
___ staff teachers (N=)
___ aides (N=)
___ interns, student teachers (N=)
___ principal
___ consultant (_____)
___ (other) _____
___ " _____

(a) Indicate with * any attending who are NOT regular members.

(b) On separate sheet, describe content, purpose, interactions, decisions, plans, problems, as observed in Unit meeting.

---

4. ___ Library or IMC media-center. (Circle its name). Visited ___ minutes.

Staff consists of
___ full-time librarian (or director)
___ part-time librarian (or director)
___ full-time aide ___ part-time aide

Other
___ _____
___ _____

Check all that apply.

___ Library (in traditional sense)...books, references
___ Multi-media center
___ Curriculum collection
___ Is resource center for staff, by subject areas
___ Study area for students
___ Has students come in classroom groups on assigned schedule (weekly. .?)
___ Students come, with teacher permission, at any time for work & study
___ Students come, at any time for work & study, individually or in groups
___ Teachers come, at any time for work & study, consultation with director

How many students in and out during your observation? ___

5. Building
(a) Is IMC (library) centrally located? _____
Does location or size affect its function or utilization? _____

Are most materials openly accessible to all? ___

(b) Building is best described as...
___ Separate classrooms opening to hallways
___ Partly separate classrooms, partly open space instructional areas
___ Open space instructional areas
___ Partly large areas with movable walls, partly _____
___ (Other) _____

(c) If building has "open space," ___ it is used this way for instruction
___ it is mostly divided into "rooms" for instruction
___ it is partly divided into "rooms" for instruction

(d) What specific plans are there for altering the building during this year or before next September? _____

(e) Is any unit geographically separated from the rest of the school? ____
If so, why or how? _____

6. Classes in Action
(a) Which of these instructional groupings did you observe through the day?
___ independent study
___ tutorial (teacher-student)
___ tutorial (pupil-pupil)
___ small group (3 to 11)
___ medium group (12 to 19)
___ class-sized group (20 to 30)
___ large group (31+)

(b) Which grouping appears to be most frequent or typical? _____

(c) Did you observe a unit where several groupings were receiving instruction at the same time? Smooth? Chaotic? Organized? Teachers, aides all busy? Quiet?

(d) Was there evidence of "true" individualized education in action? (Objectives, assessment, instruction, regrouping, self-selection, testing, learning modes...)

(e) Did schedule appear to be followed? Workable? Satisfactory?

7. Other formal meeting or occasion you attended (other than in-service or the above); Please describe.

8. What observations re the total school context, the atmosphere, the "IGE millieu?"

OTHER through observation and interview.

Other purposes of the visit are outlined here, in content terms; most are not so amenable to checklists or fill-ins. A couple of principles may be helpful. One is that the visit can get data not easily obtainable by questionnaire; another is that the visit can serve to verify what is reported by questionnaire as well as to serve as a means for developing new or clarified questionnaire items. In the visits we are concerned with the dynamics of the MUSE/IGE school, as observed.

For example, we may be told that there is an IIC and that an IGE subject is operative. But we can now examine more closely what occurs during an IIC meeting...what leadership is exercised...can see what materials are being used in the school...can note how the unit team works and plans together...can sense to what extent there is individually guided education...and so on.

Observing and interviewing can be used to corroborate one another; and also, what we pick up in one we can then pursue in the other.

Teachers, Units, and Program

1. How the units meet, plan, work together. What problems the unit tackles. Major decisions and outcomes so far.
2. How unit leaders and staff teachers were chosen (spring or summer).
3. Schedule: does it have 2- to 3-hour blocks for unit's flexible instruction?
4. Do all teachers in unit teach all subjects to an extent? Or departmentalized?
5. Planning time: enough? Used well? Do teachers tend to work alone or as an active group? Can they develop objectives? What are the planning hangups?
6. What problems are posed by multiage grouping? individualized education? open space areas? assessment and grouping (& regrouping) Ss for instruction?
7. What are aides' functions? Teachers satisfied with aides' assistance? Aides trained?
8. What subject(s) are now IGE'd? To what extent? Plan to add other subjects? What (published) curricula in use? If have IGE in 1 or 2 subjects, how is the rest of the day handled? How do "special subjects" fit into IGE philosophy?
9. UNITS: How many, what age-ranges, how many Ss in each, what staff, what IGE subject?

Kids

1. What reactions do children (a few) have to new patterns? being with other ages? having more freedom to learn and study? having several teachers?
2. Do they make decisions? Of what sort?
3. What effects do teachers feel MUSE/IGE has had on student learning, discipline, independence, confusion, security? Are some pupils at a disadvantage?...What?
4. Do kids know what unit they are in? Know who is their "unit leader"? ASK THEM.

The Principal and IIC

1. What advantages and disadvantages do teachers and principals see now in MUSE/IGE? Satisfactions? Reactions to training? Need more training? Frustrations?
2. What are IIC's major problems so far? What has been solved? What are the units' major problems now? What plans for solution? Does IIC "produce" each week?
3. What impacts so far in school or district...grading, promotion, building layout, discipline, materials, curriculum, record-keeping, relationships among faculty member, parental reactions, achievement...
4. How has principal's role changed? Like it? Major challenges thus far? Personnel problems? District influences on his role? What problems to solve later?
5. Has the role of the IMC-librarian changed? To what? Member of IIC?

6. Does the school use or follow an implementation guide? Which one? How? Does it have a timetable? a masterplan? Are there local evaluation plans or activities? What end-result do they view for the school? How do they view their own progress "to date"?
7. What antecedents appear related to school's involvement? District attitudes? previous team teaching, multiage grouping, continuous progress, individualized curricula, etc?
8. What connections with other schools...league, pact, other kind of linkage? See value in this?

Training

1. What are the in-service activities and plans? Regular or otherwise? Use consultants...from where? Who plans? Who leads?
2. Is in-service for the whole school staff? Why not? Is such training accomplished by the one school, or in league with other schools. Where does impetus lie...in the school, district, or league? Or with the state coordinator?
3. Do they have and use the films, books?
4. What exposure and training has the staff had? Unit leaders? Principal? Do they view it as sufficient?
5. Whom do they call on for "help" or advice? What have they already done in this connection? Does help come best from films, books, nearby schools, R & D Center, state coordinator, "outside" consultants, or...?

WHAT ACTIVITIES OR LEADS OR PLANS are there which you feel should be followed-up in the next visit to this school?

SCHOOL _____ VISITOR _____ IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Attended how much of training _____ Observation, Interview & Indirect Inquiry

Dates of in-service training _____

1. Check procedures used for each topic	TOPICS A	B	C	D
Formal lecture				
Simulation				
Viewing films, strips				
Brainstorming				
Panel presentation				
Demonstration				
Quiz & discussion				
General discussion				
Small group discussion				
Role-playing				
Workshop (with a product)				
Study of materials, tests				

What specific topics were dealt with?

A _____

B _____

C _____

D _____

2. What was overall content and purpose?

3. Did topics appear directly related to MUSE/IGE? ____ If not, was some explanation given or was relevance to MUSE/IGE mentioned? Describe.

4. Did training focus on one specific topic from "problem to solution?" Or were topics treated in a more cursory and exploratory way?

5. What outcomes? (Decisions, plans, workshop products, forms, actions, etc.)

* 6. Was there an agenda/program? ___ Was it followed? ___ Were there objectives? ___

7. In-service session lasted ___ hours or ___ days, total.

8. Other comments re Purpose, Topics, Mechanics, Workspace, Organization, Handling, Schedule, etc.

* Send in copies of all such documents, and related ones.

In-Service - Page 2

9. Who took major leadership roles? What roles?

___ Principal _____

___ Unit leader(s) _____

___ Consultants _____

___ (Other) _____

___ No particular leadership evident

10. Did it appear that the IIC had planned the meeting, carried it through? ____
If not, what was the "driving force?"

11. The meeting was
___ part of long-range in-service plans
___ a response to a given current need or problem (not regular)
___ a pro forma session
___ directed to needs or interests of less than whole staff
___ held with staffs of other school(s)
___ (in part) like the traditional "teachers' meeting"
___ _____
___ _____

12. Who attended from school staff or school community?
___ all staff teachers
___ all aides
___ all unit leaders
___ principal
___ all "special" teachers
___ librarian, media specialist, or IMC director
___ reading (or math) consultant
___ _____

Explain here exceptions, or omission of certain groups or individuals:

13. Check any of the following who...

WERE PRESENT		TOOK ACTIVE ROLES
___	State coordinator	___
___	District coordinator	___
___	Other district personnel ( )	___
___	R & D Center consultant	___
___	District consultant	___
___	Personnel from other MUSE school(s)	___
___	*Other consultants (what position or agency? _____)	___
___	_____	___
___	_____	___

14. On another sheet, expand and comment on any of the above in more detail, with special attention to numbers 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 13.
Also give your impressions of the following: a) level of participation by staff, b) whether meeting was well-planned and executed, c) strengths and weaknesses, d) apparent staff attitudes toward topic and handling, e) value of meeting, f) whether topic appears timely, g) overall effectiveness & productivity.
And determine what the overall in-service plans are for the year. Is there a plan? Is in-service viewed as useful, or essential? Does the school plan on its own, or rely on outside impetus?